THE THEOLOGY OF THE GENEVA BIBLE OF 1560:
A STUDY IN ENGLISH PROTESTANTISM

by

Dan Gordon Danner

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the School of Religion
in the Graduate College of
The University of Iowa

June, 1969

Thesis supervisor: Professor James C. Spalding

Graduate College
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

PH.D. THESIS

This is to certify that the Ph.D. thesis of

Dan Gordon Danner

with a major in Religion has been approved by the Examining Committee as satisfactory for the thesis requirement for the Ph.D. degree at the convocation of June, 1969.

Thesis committee: James C. Spalding
Thesis supervisor

J. Kenneth Kuntz
Member

George W. Forell
Member

James M. Kittelson
Member

Sidney E. Mead
Member

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express special thanks to the faculty of the School of Religion for its excellence both in the sphere of academic leadership and in the sphere of personal interest. Special acknowledgment is due Dr. James C. Spalding, who has spent untiringly of his time and influence, without which my graduate career at Iowa would not have been the pleasant and beneficial experience it has been.

I would also like to acknowledge my debt to Dr. James M. Kittelson, of the History Department of Iowa, who has willingly shared with me his keen acquaintance with Reformation literature.

Special acknowledgment is also due Mr. Keith Rageth and the staff of the Interlibrary Loan Division of the University Libraries.

And, I would like to personally acknowledge the assistance of my family, my two sons, Darin and Kirt, and especially my lovely wife, Dot, whose inspiration and understanding have been the key contributors to the realization of this dream.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION. 1

CHAPTER

I. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE GENEVA BIBLE 5

A History of the English Bible Leading up to the Geneva Version 5

During the Reign of Henry VIII. 6

During the Reign of Edward VI 10

During the Reign of Mary Tudor. 12

Events in Geneva 13

Whittingham's 1557 New Testament. 14

1560 Edition. 20

The Geneva Bible During the Reign of Elizabeth. 30

During Parker's Archbishopric 31

During Grindal's Archbishopric. 35

During Whitgift's Archbishopric 38

The Popularity of the Geneva Bible 39

Hampton Court Conference. 40

Examples of Printings and Usages. 41

Stages of Development of the Geneva Bible. 48

Tomson's Revision 49

CHAPTER PAGE

Tomson's Revision of Revelation 52

During Barker's Printing Monopoly 53

Conclusion: The Controversy over the Geneva Bible 55

II. A CATEGORIZATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DOCTRINES OF THE GENEVA BIBLE OF 1560. 59

Doctrine of God. 59

Doctrine of Man. 62

Revelation 65

Salvation. 69

Ethics 77

The Church and History 84

Doctrine of the State. 96

Worship, Church Order and Discipline 101

"Anti-Rome Polemic". 108

III. A COMPARISON OF THE THEOLOGY OF THE GENEVA BIBLE WITH ENGLISH AND CONTINENTAL PROTESTANTISM. 115

The English Church at Geneva: Literary Efforts Prior to 1560. 116

Anthony Gilby 118

Thomas Sampson. 134

William Whittingham 139

The Genevan Confession. 152

Summary and Evaluation. 156

CHAPTER PAGE

Continuity and Discontinuity of the Theology of the Geneva Bible with English and Continental Protestantism. . 163

Predestination. 164

Salvation 167

Word of God 173

The Lord's Supper 176

The "Deuteronomic View of History". . . 184

The State 194

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 201

LIST OF REFERENCES. 208

INTRODUCTION

The Geneva Bible of 1560 was one of the most influential English Bibles. Although it was primarily the Bible of the home in Tudor-Stuart England it went through more reprintings than any other English Bible, with the exception of the Authorized Version. Yet even the version authorized by King James had a difficult time in dislodging the popularity of the Geneva Bible.

There were many new features which probably aided in making the Geneva Bible popular. It was the first English Bible to have verse numberings. It was printed in a type easier to read. The compilers afforded different lettering when they added words to make the meaning clearer. And, better Greek and Hebrew manuscripts were used in the Geneva edition.

But the most influential feature of this Bible was its fully annotated format. Practically every verse is explained by the compilers. Each chapter is headed with the outstanding points brought out in the chapter. Each folio carries the key idea or ideas which characterize the passages within it. Every book in the Bible is prefaced by an "Argument" which the compilers believed to be the guideline for reading the books. There are prefaces to the Christian readers in England, a preface to the Queen and two helpful tables which are designed to help the reader find various passages of scripture relating to topics and subjects found in the Bible.

The reason why this annotated format was so popular is relatively simple. The annotations contained inherent presuppositions; the compilers allowed their own particular slant, theological and historical, to become a permanent part of their literary production. Thus the Geneva Bible became a theological treatise in its own right. The "theology of the Geneva Bible of 1560" made an impressive, perhaps overwhelming, contribution to English Protestantism.

This study attempts to uncover the theological presuppositions and biases the translators brought to their task. The first chapter traces the historical background of the Geneva Bible from which its contribution to English Protestantism must be viewed. The second chapter is a detailed, analytic study of the annotations themselves, in which the categorization and treatment of the annotations is presented, in order that the theology of the compilers may be seen in its purest form. The third chapter compares the theology of the Geneva Bible with both its English and Continental Protestant traditions. In this chapter, the literary efforts of the Geneva exiles prior to their task of translating are treated, in order to account for possible influences they may have had on the theology hidden in the annotations of the

Geneva Bible; the last part of the chapter attempts to show the continuity and discontinuity of the theology of the Geneva Bible with both English and Continental Protestants. The reason for the comparison in the fourth chapter is to determine, perhaps more clearly, the real contributions of this unusual Bible.

The methodology followed in this thesis is basically a historical one. While there are some basic philosophical and theological pitfalls in this methodology, it is hoped that these have been at least partially overcome with as much objectivity the author could command. Throughout this study, an emphasis has been placed on the search for original and primary sources, from which conclusions and impressions have been drawn. Doubtless some of the conclusions are sounder than others. Nevertheless, within the limits of historical research, this project has taken account of the original materials which were open to it.

There are two main theses at work throughout the following pages. One should be very clear, the other has been purposely subdued. Because many historians are convinced that the Geneva Bible fostered the teachings of Calvin in sixteenth and seventeenth century England, there is a constant comparison of the theology of the compilers of the Bible with the theological thought of John Calvin. The cutting edge of this comparison becomes one of the contributions of this thesis, that Calvin's influence is only indirect and of considerably less importance than has heretofor been recognized. The other thesis which has been subdued for purposes of emphasis is that the theology of the exiles in Geneva who produced the Geneva Bible is almost totally dependent upon the nature of the biblical materials with which they worked. In the company of many Christian humanists, especially in England, the exiles believed in the inspiration of the Bible for their own day. The Bible became their divine pattern of authority. It was the determinative criterion for their actions, doctrines and church policy. If the Bible seemingly contradicted itself, the exiles either unknowingly or knowingly followed its every precept, quite willing to pay such a price. This is what made the English "the people of the Book". And, in this respect, it proved to be more of an influence in their theological development than either Luther or Calvin. They were searching for the "biblical answer", and, although there were many philosophical and theological presuppositions they brought to the text, they nevertheless strove to subserve these to their ultimate criterion.

It is in this sense that the Geneva Bible made its contribution to English Protestantism. It now remains to tell the story in full.

CHAPTER I

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE GENEVA BIBLE

Owing chiefly to humanistic influences the English Bible was the precursor of the English Reformation. Most sixteenth century Englishmen accepted in some sense the authority of the Bible. But there were no English translations of the complete New Testament in print until 1526, and no complete English Bibles until 1535. These notable innovations in vernacular editions of the Bible were the beginnings of making the English people the "people of the Book."

A History of the English Bible Leading up to the Geneva Version

The first demonstrable version of the complete Bible into English is connected with the name of John Wyclif.[1] He and his followers, the Lollards, emphasized in their preaching the supreme authority of the Scriptures. The

---

[1] For a concise survey of the history of the English Bible, see Craig R. Thompson, The Bible in English 1525-1611 (Washington: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1958) pp. 1-18. Its few inaccuracies do not totally undermine the overall usefulness of the book.

Wyclifites made two translations from the Vulgate: the earlier (c. 1381-1383) by Nicholas Hereford, and a later revision by John Purvey and others (1395). But in 1409, a convocation meeting at Oxford under Archbishop Arundel, forbade translation of the Bible into English and the expounding of any translation until it could be properly approved.[2]

During the Reign of Henry VIII

The Reformation focused on the centrality of the Scriptures which was made possible by the efforts of humanists like Erasmus. Doubtless it was both the humanistic groundwork and the focus on the Bible by Reformers which led William Tyndale, perhaps the greatest of the translators of the English Bible, to begin the work of an English translation. Rebuffed by the Bishop of London whose support he sought for his project of translating the New Testament from Greek, Tyndale went to Germany in 1524. His translation, made from Erasmus' Greek text, Luther's German version, and the Vulgate, was ready to print in 1525 at Cologne. Various reprints appeared between 1526 and 1532, an unauthorized revision in 1534, then a revision by Tyndale himself in the same year. However, his work on the Old Testament was cut short by martyrdom in 1536. His versions of the Pentateuch and Jonah were published in 1530-1531. Other portions of the Old Testament, left in manuscript translation, were printed after his death.

---

[2] The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe, edited by Stephen R. Cattley (London: Seeley and Burnside, 1837), Vol. III, p. 245.

The authorities reacted strongly to Tyndale's work. Copies of the New Testament were quickly banned or destroyed. In 1530, a royal injunction forbade buying or keeping an English Bible. Yet by 1535 a complete English Bible had come out with official permission. Things had changed: Henry had broken with Rome to assert his role as the "Supreme Head" of the Church of England.

The first complete Bible printed in English was the work of Miles Coverdale. Printed somewhere on the Continent, and inscribed to Henry as "our Moses," two editions were promptly printed in England, one of which "set forth with the King's most gracious license."[3] Coverdale used Tyndale's Pentateuch and New Testament but revised them somewhat. He omitted the notes Tyndale had included in later editions, but he did not alter some of the Protestant emphases such as the translation of "congregation" for "church", or "repentance" for "penance". His version of the Psalter is the earliest form of the Psalter used in the Book of Common Prayer. Coverdale's was the earliest printed edition of the Apocrypha to be included in the English Bible, where it appeared for the first time between the Testaments in English Bibles.

---

[3] From Coverdale's Prologe into the Christian Reader. See Brooke Foss Westcott, A General View of the History of the English Bible, 3rd edition revised by W. A. Wright (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916), p. 59.

The next translation was the work of John Rogers, but attributed to "Thomas Matthew" on the title-page. This 1537 edition had official approval, for, since Archbishop Cranmer was unable to interest the bishops in making a translation, he persuaded Thomas Cromwell to license this Bible. Cranmer expressed his favoritism for Matthew's Bible, an edition transmitted from Tyndale's condemned translation, but now government sanctioned.

A revision of Matthew's Bible was published by Richard Taverner in 1539, but it could not compete with the Great Bible, also a revision of Matthew's Bible directed by Coverdale. The first edition was dated 1539, and Cranmer wrote a preface to the 1540 editions which now enjoyed the powerful support of the government, for this edition was the Bible "appointed to the use of the churches." Before the first edition had appeared, Cromwell ordered the clergy to see that every parish church obtain a copy upon publication. Ironically, Cromwell was put to death shortly after its publication in July, 1540.

Cromwell's death seems to indicate a stifling of the printing of English Bibles. H. W. Hoare suggests that one effect of the Vice-Gerent's removal was that "Coverdale's 'pointing hands' ceased to appear in the Great Bible," since all hope of introducing annotations was now finally extinguished.[4] Bishops Tunstall and Heath, who had caused their names to be printed on the title pages of the Great Bible in approval, now affirmed "they never meddled therewith."[5] After December 1541, no more English Bibles were printed during Henry's reign. In 1542, a proposal was made in convocation in the King's name for a translation of the New Testament to be undertaken by the bishops. The task was interrupted by Stephen Gardiner who pressed for the retention of a large number of Latin terms. The King, by Cranmer's influence, resolved to refer the translation to the two universities. But the universities did nothing.[6]

In 1543, Parliament proscribed all translations bearing the name of Tyndale and required that the notes in all other copies be removed. At the same time no women, laborers and lower classmen were allowed to read the Bible to themselves or to others, publicly or privately, under pain of imprisonment. Only the Great Bible remained unforbidden in 1546. In this year doubtless many Bibles were destroyed, especially those bearing the names of Tyndale and Coverdale, at the hands of bishops like Tunstall and Heath.[7] In the same year, Henry, with tears in his eyes, addressing a weeping Parliament, complained that Tyndale's New Testament was "disputed, rhymed, sung and jangled in every alehouse and tavern."[8]

---

[4] H. W. Hoare, *The Evolution of the English Bible* (London: John Murray, 1902, 2nd edition), p. 206.

[5] Ira M. Price, *The Ancestry of Our English Bible* (3rd Revised Edition by William A. Irwin and Allen P. Wikgren, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956), p. 260.

[6] Westcott, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

During the Reign of Edward VI

No new versions of the English Bible were attempted under Edward VI, but all restrictions on the printing and reading of the current versions were removed.[9] Nevertheless, the Injunctions of 1547 contained a qualifying phrase that no man "authorised and licensed thereto" shall be discouraged from reading the Bible.[10] The idea of a new revision was entertained by Fagius and Bucer at the request of Cranmer, but both men fell ill and the project went for nothing.[11] Reprints were quite numerous, Matthew's Bible, the Great Bible and Tyndale's New

---

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 86. ✓

[8] J. Isaacs, "The Sixteenth-Century English Versions," *The Bible in Its Ancient and English Versions*, H. Wheeler Robinson, ed. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1940), p. 180.

[9] Hoare, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

[10] David Daiches, *The King James Version of the English Bible* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941), p. 54.

[11] Westcott, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

Testament being the most favored, and Coverdale's Bible was also reprinted. Even Taverner's version of the Old Testament was touched up and reissued with Tyndale's New Testament.[12]

The young King was especially devoted to the Bible. To him the "Sword of the Spirit" was to be preferred before "other swords".[13] Thirty-five New Testaments and thirteen Bibles[14] were published in England in the six and a half years he occupied the throne. The Injunctions of 1547 required that all beneficed persons have "one book of the whole Bible, of the largest volume in English" and "the 'Paraphrasis' of Erasmus also in English upon the Gospels, and the same set up in some convenient place within the . . . church."[15] In 1548, Cranmer instituted inquiries for the fulfillment of these injunctions in his articles for the visitation of the diocese of Canterbury, requiring that priests "have of their own the New Testament both in Latin and English and the Paraphrase of Erasmus upon the same."[16]

---

[12] Alfred W. Pollard, Records of the English Bible, the Documents Relating to the Translation and Publication of the Bible in English, 1525-1611 (London: Oxford University Press, 1911), p. 24.

[13] John Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1822), Vol. II, Part One, p. 35.

[14] Anderson says there were fourteen; but the source of his information is problematic. Christopher Anderson, The Annals of the English Bible (Revised by Hugh Anderson, London: Jackson, Walford and Hodder, 1862), p. 649.

[15] Edward Cardwell, Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England (Oxford: The University Press, 1844), Vol. I, p. 9.

During the Reign of Mary Tudor

During Mary's reign the public use of Bibles was forbidden. Many copies of the Bible previously set up in churches were burned, although Westcott suggests that they were not sought out or confiscated.[17] It was during this time that Englishmen fled to the Continent for refuge. Many sought out the famous cities of the reformers, Frankfort, Basel, Strasburg and Geneva. In 1557, in Geneva, William Whittingham translated the New Testament. This edition of the New Testament was "perusing in England, for some time before the Queen's death."[18] Just how much Whittingham's edition was spreading in England is difficult to determine. Foxe recounts an instance, involving William Living, a "priest of some learning," who complained that on being conveyed to prison as a victim of Bonner's cruelty, the jailor carried him first to his own house in Paternoster Row, and "there robbed me of my purse, my girdle, my Psalter, and a New Testament of Geneva."[19]

---

[16] Westcott, op. cit., p. 87.

[17] Ibid., p. 89.

[18] Anderson, op. cit., p. 447.

[19] Foxe, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 529.

Events in Geneva

After the "troubles at Frankfort" involving Knox and Cox over the Edwardian Prayerbook, Knox led several discontented preachers, including William Whittingham, with him to Geneva. It was in Geneva that Whittingham prepared his translation of the New Testament to be published in 1557. Calvin and Beza were both in Geneva to welcome the exiles as well as to assist in any literary efforts they aspired to publish. Beza is generally considered to have been the most competent biblical scholar of his day. F. F. Bruce suggests that Beza and others in Geneva had contributed greatly to the better establishment and elucidation of the biblical text.[20] In addition, the English exiles found a group of Frenchmen in Geneva engaged in a revision of the French Bible in the light of the expert knowledge of which was available there. Thus, having the opportunity of consulting Calvin and Beza[21] and imbibing in the literary and religious revival of Geneva, it became apparent to Whittingham that a new translation of the New Testament was needed.

---

[20] F. F. Bruce, The English Bible (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 86.

[21] John Strype, Memorials of Thomas Cranmer (Oxford: The University Press, 1840), Vol. I, p. 509. For a detailed treatment of the exiles in Geneva, see Charles Martin, Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève au temps de Calvin 1555-1560 (Geneva: A. Jullien, Editeur, 1915).

Whittingham's 1557 New Testament

The Geneva New Testament of 1557 does not name its author and translator, but there can be little doubt that it was Whittingham.[22] Throughout the preface to the 1557 Testament the singular pronoun is used, whereas the plural pronoun is used in the prefaces to the 1560 edition. There are enough significant differences between the complete 1560 edition and the 1557 Testament to warrant the conclusion that the author of the Testament was working independently.[23]

Whittingham's New Testament allegedly "conferred diligently with the Greke, and best approued translations. With the argvments, aswel before the Chapters, as for euery Boke & Epistle, also diuersities of readings, and moste proffitable annotations of all harde places."[24] Whittingham acknowledged his own zeal in the project being "consellled by the godly and drawen by occasion, both of the place where God hath appointed vs to dwel, and also the store of heauenly learning" which was so much in evidence in Geneva, "that iustely it may be called the patron and mirrour of true religion and godlynes."[25]

---

[22] See Pollard, op. cit., p. 24, Anderson, op. cit., p. 448, and W. F. Moulton, The History of the English Bible (5th edition, London: Charles H. Kelly, 1911), p. 158.

[23] Westcott, op. cit., p. 91.

[24] See Pollard, op. cit., p. 25 for the text.

The preface continues,

> To these therfore which are of the flocke of Christ which knowe their Fathers wil, and are affectioned to the trueth, I rendre a reason of my doing in a fewe lines. First as touching the perusing of the text, it was diligently reuised by the moste approued Greke examples, and conference of translations in other tonges [sic] as the learned may easely iudge, both by the faithful rendering of the sentence, and also by the proprietie of the wordes and perspicuitie of the phrase. Forthermore that the Reader might be by all meanes profitted, I haue deuided the text into verses and sections, according to the best editions in other langages, and also, as to this day the ancient Greke copies mencion, it was wont to be vsed. And because the Hebrew and Greke phrases which are strange to rendre in other tongues, and also shorte, shulde not be so harde, I haue some tyme interpreted them without any whit diminishing the grace of the sense, as our langage doth vse them, and sometyme haue put to that worde, which lacking made the sentence obscure, but haue set it in letters as may easely be discerned from the commun texte.[26]

The system of annotations and the critical marks by which Whittingham drew attention to differences in the Greek manuscripts are explained in the preface, as well as a fairly lengthy defence of the value of the "Arguments" and the chapter summaries, "whereof the commoditie is so great that they may serue in stede of a Commentarie to the Reader." The preface is preceded by "an Epistle declaring that Christ is the end of the Law," by John Calvin.

---

[25] Ibid., p. 275f.

[26] Ibid.

The influence of Calvin and Beza is unmistakable. The congregation of exiles at Geneva, to insure the accuracy of the rendering, were moved "with one assent to requeste 2 off there brethren, to witt, Calvin and Beza, eftsonnes to peruse the same notwithstandinge their former travells."[27] Calvin had already helped in the French Bible translated by his kinsman Olivetan in 1535. Whittingham's New Testament and the 1560 edition of the Geneva Bible made liberal use of some of the features of Olivetan's French translation.

Yet Whittingham's New Testament is substantially Tyndale's translation, with certain changes from the Great Bible, and many new renderings based on Beza.[28] It is not known decisively which edition of Tyndale Whittingham used. Isaacs suggests it was the edition of 1534, while Charles C. Butterworth seems to find sufficient evidence that it was the quarto edition which Richard Jugge had published in 1552. In a comparison of Tyndale's edition (1535), the Great Bible (1539) and Jugge's quarto of Tyndale (1552) with the Geneva New Testament of 1557, Butterworth shows that Whittingham probably depended more upon Jugge's edition of Tyndale than any other English translation.[29] Butterworth's case is weakened somewhat by his inability to compare Whittingham's New Testament with Beza's Latin translation, although he does recognize some dependency of Whittingham on Beza. The Geneva New Testament of 1557 introduced many new renderings, and is not merely a reprint of Jugge, but the substantial use of Jugge's edition of 1552 is unmistakable.[30]

---

[27] Quoted by Isaacs, p. 183.

[28] Ibid. See also Nicholas Pocock, "Some Notices of the Geneva Bible," The Bibliographer (September, 1884), p. 106.

Thus Whittingham contributed several significant innovations to the history of the English Bible. In addition to Roman rather than black-letter type, he introduced the division of verses[31] and the use of italics into the text, both of which became regular features of subsequent editions of the English Bible. The notes and annotations are much fuller than in the Great Bible, and one notable feature was the use of "church" as a translation of εκκλησία instead of "congregation" which Tyndale and Coverdale had favored.[32] The Apocrypha was omitted. The printing was completed at Geneva on June 10, 1557, by Conrad Badius, "the book being a pretty little 32°, in the style at that time specially popular at Lyons, with ornamental capitals and headpieces."[33]

---

[29] Charles C. Butterworth, The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible, 1340-1611 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941), p. 160. Moulton ran a similar test on the basis of Whittingham's translation of Luke 16. Moulton concluded that Whittingham departed from Tyndale some 40 times, and in 30 of these the rendering is new (probably based on Beza), and in 8 of the 30 the new renderings obtained a place in the A.V. See p. 159.

[30] Schwarz shows the proximity of Whittingham's New Testament with Tyndale's translation, and that both were dependent on Erasmus' interpretation; e.g. Romans 14:14, where the Geneva 1557 rendering is identical to Tyndale's, both being influenced by Erasmus' note. See W. Schwarz, Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation; Some Reformation Controversies and their Background (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1955), p. 188.

There is some discrepancy regarding the reprinting of this New Testament. Dore seems to think no second edition was published and that this fact might be due to its "convenient size for carriage in the pocket," for few "perfect copies of this book" were in existence when

---

[31] The first printed Bible indicating the verse divisions was Sanctes Pagninus' literal translation into Latin in 1528, where the text is printed in paragraphs but the verses are numbered in the margin. The source of the Geneva verse division is usually said to be Robert Estienne's (Stephanus) Geneva New Testament of 1550 or 1551, and his Bible of 1555. However, the immediate source of the Geneva treatment of verses is not the earlier Stephanus prints, in which the verses, though numbered, are not set out but run on in paragraphs, but the edition of 1556-1557, containing the Old Testament of Pagninus, the Apocrypha of Baduellus, and the first edition of Beza's translation of the New Testament. See Isaacs, p. 185.

[32] Bruce, op. cit., p. 86.

[33] Pollard, op. cit., p. 25.

Dore wrote in 1888.[34] Francis Fry, who collected English Bibles throughout his life, confessed he had never seen a reprint of the 1557 New Testament.[35] However, the Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society does include an edition of the 1557 New Testament printed in 1575, although certain traces of revision caused the editors to conclude that the text "agrees generally with that of the 1560 Bible."[36] There is no way of knowing how popular this New Testament was, and a safe conclusion is that most Englishmen were content to use the New Testament which was published with the 1560 edition of the Geneva Bible although there are marked differences between them. There is no evidence that the 1557 Testament was ever published with the 1560 edition of the Old Testament.[37]

---

[34] John R. Dore, Old Bibles (2nd Edition, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1888), p. 191.

[35] Francis Fry, "Standard Edition of the English New Testament of the Genevan Version," Journal of Sacred Literature (July, 1864), pp. 279-289.

[36] T. H. Darlow and H. F. Moule, Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society (London: The Bible House, 1903), Vol. I, p. 81.

[37] Ibid., p. 60.

1560 Edition

The 1560 edition of the complete Bible was probably begun as a continuation of Whittingham's New Testament of 1557. One would expect Whittingham to play a leading role in the translation. However, that the Bible is the work of several men is evident not only from the use of "we" in the preface to the readers, but also in the differences which distinguished the New Testament of 1560 from Whittingham's Testament. Any number of the Genevan exiles could have contributed to the 1560 edition, including Knox, Goodman, Coverdale, Bodley, Cole, Pullain, Gilby, Sampson and Whittingham. Nevertheless, the three men who probably contributed more to the final draft were Gilby, Sampson and Whittingham. When the good news of Elizabeth's ascension reached Geneva in December, 1558, the greater part of the book was not finished. Anthony Wood says Whittingham "with one or two more" stayed at Geneva to finish the task.[38] An anonymous "Student of the Temple, about 1603" wrote a life of Whittingham which serves as a preface to the latter's A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort, published in London in 1575. This author affirms that when Mary died most Englishmen returned home.

---

[38] Anthony Wood, Athenae Oxonienses (London, 1813), Vol. I, p. 447.

> saving some of them only, and not all, that were engaged in the Translation of the Bible: so as Master WHITTINGHAM did tarry in Geneva, for the finishing of that Translation, a year and a half after Queen ELIZABETH began her reign. He also there turned into metre those Psalms of the Geneva Psalms. . . .[39]

It seems that the company of the Genevan exiles kept a brief record of their history as members of a religious community, and that this record, on their return to England, was left in Geneva. It was preserved in the archives of the Hotel Deville and still remains in one of the Genevan public libraries. This document, entitled Livre des Anglais,[40] has been perused by both English and French scholars and has been checked with the Registres de Conseil of the city of Geneva. Investigations have shown that it was necessary, in order to leave Geneva, for those so desiring to submit a request to the city council. Several among the ministers of Geneva requested permission to leave on January 24, 1559, and the permission seems to have been granted. The last departure took place at the end of the month of May, 1560. Whittingham and several companions asked permission to leave, offered their thanks to the city fathers and left a record or a book as a perpetual memorial of their gratitude. They were given an honorable dismissal, exhorted to pray for Geneva and "always be ready to bear good affection to this city." The "Book" bears the title Livre des Anglais though the contents are in English. The contents are mainly lists of persons of the English company, ministers, deacons, elders elected annually, and records of baptisms, marriages, and burials.

---

[39] William Whittingham, A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort, 1554-1558 A.D. (London: Elliot Stock, 1575, Introduction by Edward Arber), p. 4.

[40] This document has been made available by J. Southernden Burn, published at London in 1831, and later inserted into his History of Parish Registers. The facsimile in possession of the present writer was provided by the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., with a prefatory note by A. F. Mitchell (no date). It will be found also with historical analysis, in two articles, Horatio B. Hackett, "Church-Book of the Puritans at Geneva, from 1555 to 1560," Bibliotheca Sacra (July, 1862), pp. 469ff., and Th. Heyer, "Notice sur la Colonie Anglaise, Établie à Genèva de 1555 à 1560," Memoires et Documents, publiés par la Sociétié d'histore d'archéologie de Genèva, Vol. IX, 1855, pp. 337-368, as well as in Martin, pp. 43-78.

These investigations corroborate Anderson's conclusion that Knox and Goodman left Geneva in 1559 for Scotland, and Coverdale, Cole, Pullain and Bodley returned to England the same year. The common supposition that Coverdale had a hand in the translation[41] is made precarious by the fact that he was known to have preached in England during the year 1559.[42] Thus there can be little question that Anthony Gilby, Thomas Sampson and William Whittingham were the principal collaborators in the 1560 edition of the Geneva Bible. Butterworth suggests that Sampson was "the most important collaborator of the trio,"[43] but this may be merely a generalization based on Sampson's ability as a Hebrew scholar. Whittingham recounts that when Kethe returned to Geneva with the "Answers from the Congregations and Companies that were dispersed in sundry places" of Germany and Switzerland in January of 1559, the congregation

---

[41] Fry, loc. cit.

[42] See the article by H. R. Tedder in Dictionary of National Biography, edited by Leslie Stephen (London: Smith, Elder and Company, 1887), Vol. XII, p. 364f.

> prepared themselves to depart: saving certain which remained behind the rest to wit, to finish the Bible and the Psalms both in metre and prose: which were already begun, at the charges of such as were of most ability in that congregation.[44]

It would seem to the present writer that the three men worked closely together; perhaps Sampson's voice was prominent regarding Hebrew texts and nuances of the Old Testament, Whittingham leading the New Testament translation with a closer appraisal of Beza's Latin translation, and Gilby acting as the coordinator of both Testaments, perhaps even playing the key role in authoring the annotations and "Arguments". It should be noted, however, that all three played a decisive role in each phase of the edition, and that Whittingham doubtless served as the inspiration for the endeavor.

---

[43] Butterworth, _op_. _cit_., p. 165.

[44] Whittingham, _op_. _cit_., p. 228.

The method pursued by the Old Testament translators was to use the Great Bible as a base, correcting its text whenever the Hebrew text warranted it, "without ever substituting for it a new translation."[45] One of their chief aims was to make the translation as verbal as possible, and consequently they replaced the rougher Zurich renderings of Coverdale or Münster by the smoother renderings of Pagninus. Westcott observes that the translators were "perfectly competent to deal independently with points of Hebrew scholarship; and minute changes in expression shew that they were not indifferent to style."[46] The orthography of the Hebrew names was derived from Pagninus' Latin translation, and many portions of the Old Testament are traceable to the Latin versions of Münster and Leo Juda, as well as to the French Bible of Olivetan.[47] The Apocrypha was included in the 1560 edition. It was influenced somewhat by Beza's French translation, but its main significance was its return to Greek instead of Latin manuscripts.[48]

The New Testament made more use of Beza's Latin translation which was published in 1556. Probably some use of Stephanus' New Testament was made by the translators. It is fairly clear that the 1560 edition of the New Testament was not the same as Whittingham's 1557 edition. Francis Fry conducted a test in which he compared the two editions and concluded unequivocally "the text of 1557 was discarded by the translators of the Genevan version."[49] Moulton conducted a similar test[50] and concluded that just as the 1557 Testament was a careful revision of Tyndale, the 1560 Testament was a careful revision of Whittingham's 1557 edition.[51] However, the greater part of the notes from the 1557 Testament were transferred to the 1560 edition. John Eadie has observed that in the first nine chapters of Matthew, out of 134 notes, there are only twenty not taken from the earlier New Testament.[52] The notes in the 1560 edition are fuller and in greater detail than those of Whittingham's Testament.

---

[45] Westcott, op. cit., p. 222.

[46] Ibid.

[47] Moulton, op. cit., pp. 164-165.

[48] Ibid., p. 165.

John Strype called attention to eleven features of the 1560 Geneva Bible.

(1) The notation in the margins of "diversities of speech, and reading, especially according to the Hebrew."

---

[49] Fry, loc. cit.

[50] See above, p. 16.

[51] Moulton, op. cit., p. 159.

[52] John Eadie, The English Bible (London: Macmillan and Company, 1876), Vol. II, p. 8.

(2) "Where the Hebrew speech seemed hardly to agree with ours, they noted in the margin, using that which was more intelligible."

(3) Some Hebrew names were altered from the old texts, and restored "to the true writing"; however, usual names were changed very little, "for fear of troubling the simple readers."

(4) The use of "another kind of letter" when the necessity of the original texts demanded it for clarity and meaningfulness.[53]

(5) Following the division of verses, adding the number to each verse.

(6) Principal matters were "noted," along with "Arguments both for each book and for each chapter."

(7) Over the head of every page was set some notable word or sentence.

(8) "They set brief annotations upon all the hard places, as well for the understanding of obscure words, as for declaration of the text. And for this purpose they diligently read the best commentaries, and had much conference with godly and learned brethren."

(9) "They set forth with figures certain places in the books of Moses, of the Kings, and Ezekiel, which seemed so dark, that by no other description they could be made easy to the reader."

(10) The addition of certain maps.

(11) The addition of two "profitable tables: the one of interpretations of Hebrew names,[54] and the other containing all the chief and principal matters of the whole Bible."[55]

---

[53] For the source of the use of italics, see Isaacs, p. 186.

[54] For an interesting discussion of the popularity of Old Testament names among the Puritans, see Charles W. Bardsley, Curiosities of Puritan Nomenclature (London: Chatto and Windus, 1897), pp. 38ff.

[55] John Strype, The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker, (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1821), Vol. I, pp. 410ff.

Strype neglected to point out that many of the first printings of the 1560 edition were printed in quarto for handling ease. But he has surely indicated the striking points which were soon to make the Geneva Bible the most popular Bible in England.

By far the most striking of all the features of 1560 edition were the notes, prefaces, "Arguments" and annotations. Some historians are prone to call them a "Calvinist Manifesto" or a "Puritan Dogmatics". Others are more reserved in their appellations.[56] The notes serve as a kind of running commentary--"vigorous and lucid, dogmatic and practical, presenting such aspects of truth and duty as were then all but universally prized, and such political lessons as the History of England so naturally shaped and suggested."[57] Most of the notes were original, though many historians feel there were some which were selected from Calvin and Beza.[58] Hoare suggests that the explanatory notes took the place of the "prophesyings,"

> those gatherings for mutual edification and instruction of the clergy, in which Elizabeth fancied that she could detect the cloven hoof of faction

---

[56] See below, pp. 55ff.

[57] Eadie, op. cit., p. 15.

[58] Ibid., p. 28. As will be shown below, Tomson's edition of the New Testament incorporated more of Beza's notes than the 1560 edition. See pp. 55ff.

and disloyality. So the book was thus made self-interpreting.[59]

Nevertheless, the scholarship of the trio is generally recognized as "of the highest" and "ahead of their times."[60] They were adroit to the extent of recognizing several quotations in the New Testament from pagan authors.[61] Here and there in the New Testament the margins contain the translation of certain variant readings found in Codex Bezae.[62] John Gardiner claims a greater accuracy for the Genevan translation. It set a precedent in English biblical translation for taking account of the original languages.[63] The Geneva Bible forms a turning point in the evolution of the English Bible, breaking with the line of Tyndale translations, and beginning anew on the basis of Hebrew and Greek texts. It formed the principal basis of the King James Version, and a large number of its innovations were eventually included in all subsequent English versions.[64]

---

[59] Hoare, op. cit., p. 221.

[60] Bruce M. Metzger, "The Geneva Bible of 1560," Theology Today (October, 1960), pp. 339-352.

[61] Ibid., Cf. Acts 17:28; 1 Cor. 15:33; Tit. 1:2.

[62] Metzger, loc. cit. It is probable that the Genevan translators secured information about its readings from the margins of the 1550 edition of the Greek New Testament at Paris by Robert Estienne. See Metzger's "The Influence of Codex Bezae upon the Geneva Bible of 1560," New Testament Studies (October, 1961), pp. 72-79.

[63] John H. Gardiner, The Bible as English Literature (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923), p. 339. See also G. C. Macaulay, "The English Bible," Quarterly Review (October, 1911), pp. 505-530.

The funds for the project were either subscribed by the exiles themselves, or sent by friends in England, since the translators speak of

> being earnestly desired and by diuers, whose learning and godlynes we reuerence, exhorted and also encouraged by the ready willes of suche, whose heartes God likewise touched, not to spare any charges for the fortherance of suche a benefite and fauour of God toward his Churche.[65]

One such helper was John Bodley,[66] an exile with the translators, who in January, 1561, received an exclusive patent from Elizabeth to print this Bible under episcopal supervision for seven years, a grant which in March of 1565 or 1566, Parker and Grindal recommended to extend for another twelve years, though still subject to implied conditions which apparently Bodley could not accept.[67] And, because of these funds, the translators were able to purchase woodcuts for various Old Testament illustrations.

---

[64] Isaacs, _op_. _cit_., p. 186.

[65] Text in Pollard, _op_. _cit_., p. 280.

[66] According to Hackett, Bodley defrayed the entire cost of publication. See p. 509.

[67] Pollard, _op_. _cit_., p. 25. See Strype, _Parker_, p. 412.

The Geneva Bible During the Reign of Elizabeth

After Elizabeth's ascension the Great Bible was once again ordered, by the Injunctions of 1559, to be set up in churches, and new editions were printed in 1562 and 1566 by Cardin Hamilton. These new editions disarmed suspicion by stating on their title pages that they were "According to the translation apoynted by the Queenes Majesties Injunctions to be read in all Churches with in her Majesties Realme."[68] The Injunctions of 1559 did not have the qualifying phrase contained in the Edwardian Injunctions of 1547, that no man "authorised and licensed thereto" shall be discouraged from reading the Bible.[69] Daiches observes that the "idea that individuals had to be licensed before reading the Bible in English seems by this time to have disappeared . . . from the minds of the majority of Englishmen."[70] The Injunctions of 1559 provided that within

> three months after this visitation . . . one book of the whole Bible of the largest volume in English; and within one twelve months . . . the Paraphrases of Erasmus also in English . . . and the same to be set up in some convenient place within the said church . . . whereas the parishioners may most commodiously resort unto the same. . . . That every person, vicar, curate, and stipendary priest, being under the degree of a master of arts shall provide and have of his own . . . the New Testament

---

[68] Pollard, op. cit., p. 28.

[69] See above, p. 10.

[70] Daiches, op. cit., p. 54.

> both in Latin and English, with paraphrases upon the same, conferring with one another.[71]

Inquiry was to be made whether any parsons, vicars or curates discouraged any person from reading any part of the Bible, either in Latin or English.[72] Thus Elizabeth encouraged Bible reading by preachers and laymen, but the Geneva version, printed up until this time only in Geneva, was given no official backing.

During Parker's Archbishopric

Thomas Bodley applied for an extension of his privilege to publish the Geneva version. In a letter to William Cecil, March 9, 1565, Archbishop Parker says that both he and Grindal

> thought so well of the first impression and the review of those who had since travailed therein, that they wished it would please him to be a means that twelve years' longer term might be by a special privilege granted him, in consideration of the charges by him and his associates in the first impression, and the review since sustained. And that though one other special Bible for the Churches were meant by them to be set forth, as convenient time and leisure hereafter should permit; yet should it nothing hinder, but rather do much good, to have diversity of translation and readings.[73]

---

[71] Cardwell, op. cit., pp. 214-18.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Strype, Parker, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 412.

But Parker's policy of the via media is evident in his lack of support for Bodley's proposal. Pope's suggestion[74] that Bodley toned down some of the "excessively Puritan features" of the Geneva version in order to make sure of Parker's assistance has no evidence to support it. Rather it seems that the Archbishop's stipulation that any new version or the reprinting of older versions must meet with his approval precluded the publication of the Geneva Bible during his archbishopric. For, as long as Parker lived, Richard Jugge enjoyed what amounted to a monopoly as a printer of Bibles in England, and it was only in 1575, when Grindal succeeded Parker, that the first Geneva Bible was printed in England.

Parker's ambivalence is evident in his revival of the project, perhaps instigated by Richard Cox, and having failed in Cranmer's day, of a new revision to be mainly the work of the Anglican bishops. In 1566, in explaining the project to the Queen in a letter, Parker makes an obvious allusion to the Geneva Bible in which his true bias is seen. One of the primary reasons for supporting the project of a Bishops' Bible was the "diverse preiudiciall notis which might have bene also well spared" from prevailing versions.[75] On October, 5, 1568,

---

[74] Hugh Pope, English Versions of the Bible (Revised and amplified by Sebastian Bullough, St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company, 1952), p. 221.

[75] Text in Pollard, op. cit., p. 295. Cf. Daiches, p. 55.

Parker sent a copy of the freshly printed Bishops' Bible to Cecil, with a dedicatory letter to the Queen. The "Observations respected" by the translators were that they would follow the Great Bible and not "recede from it but where it varyeth manifestly from the Greek or Hebrew original," to make use of the versions of Pagninus and Münster, to abstain from controversial notes, to mark the selections unedifying for public reading, and to substitute more convenient terms and phrases for "all such words as sound in the old translation to any offence of lightnes or obscenity."[76]

Because of the Archbishop's "proviso of owr oversight" that "no impression shall passe but by our direction, consent and advise" no edition of the Geneva Bible was printed in England during his archibishopric, although one was published by John Crispin at Geneva in 1570. Pollard is doubtless correct when he observes,

> It is impossible, therefore, to avoid the conviction that to the very end of his life Parker used his control over the Stationers' Company to prevent the Geneva version being printed in England, and also to secure for Jugge the monopoly of printing the Bishops' Bible.[77]

Because the Geneva Bible had infiltrated into the homes of many Englishmen it nevertheless remained the popular edition and began to make a profound effect upon its readers. But Parker did not have an interest in the peoples' Bible reading, and the Geneva Bible was primarily the "Bible of the home" during his lifetime.

---

[76] Text in Pollard, op. cit., p. 29.

[77] Ibid., pp. 39-40.

The reaction of the translators, especially Whittingham, was quite negative and alarming. Whittingham complained that

> if that Bible be such, as no enemy of GOD could justly find fault with, then may men marvel that such a Work (being so profitable) should find so small favour as not to be printed again. If it be not faithfully translated, then let it still find as little favour as it doth, because of the inconveniences that a false translation brings with it.[78]

His complaint did not end with his own discouragement regarding the lack of support for the translation he had worked so hard to finish. The prevalent translations were hardly adequate in his way of thinking, for many of the

> English Bibles are so ill translated, as the Learned report; and so falsely printed, as the simple may find: that such had need to be very well acquainted with Scripture, as, in many places, should get out the true meaning and sense. . . . Seeing then . . . that, in most places, the Ministry doth stand; and consists of old Popish Priests, tolerated Readers, and many new-made Ministers whose readings are such that the people cannot be edified. . . . What great and intolerable mischiefs may come more and more, by suffering such corrupted Bibles in Churches and elsewhere, to the poor simple flock of CHRIST.[79]

---

[78] Whittingham, _op_. _cit_., p. 228.

[79] _Ibid_., p. 230.

But Whittingham failed to see that the objection to the Geneva Bible was mainly a rejection of its marginal notes and annotations.

Ironically, however, many of the marginal notes of the Geneva Bible were incorporated into the Bishops' version, especially into the book of Galatians.[80] It has been suggested[81] that the notes of the Geneva Bible and those of the Bishops' Bible are not clearly different, and that there was no clear trend in the Bishops' version to eliminate the "Calvinism of the Geneva annotations."[82] The main difference was the toning down of many notes having to do with predestination and election, even eliminating them altogether. However, on the matters of salvation and total depravity there is little difference between them.[83]

During Grindal's Archbishopric

It is doubtful that Elizabeth gave the Bishops' Bible any preferential treatment. Perhaps she recognized the superior scholarship of the Geneva edition. Nevertheless, in 1575, when Parker died, Jugge began to feel the loss of his patron, for the new archbishop, Edmund Grindal, was more sympathetic toward those who were trying to promote the use of the Geneva Bible. A sort of compromise between the advocates of the Bishops' Bible and those of the Geneva Bible was arranged by the Stationers' Company, whereby Jugge was allowed the exclusive right to publish Bibles of a certain size, while others were allowed the right to publish them in other sizes. In this way the obstruction to the publication of the Geneva Bible was removed.[84]

---

[80] See Price, op. cit., p. 265, and Eadie, op. cit., p. 30.

[81] Charles C. Ryrie, "Calvinistic Emphases in the Geneva and Bishops' Bibles," Bibliotheca Sacra (January, 1965), pp. 23-30.

[82] Ibid.

[83] Ibid.

In 1575, Sir Francis Walsingham and Christopher Barker employed Thomas Vautrollier to print an edition in duodecimo of the Geneva Bible. After Jugge died his monopoly of Bible-printing was challenged and won by Barker on September 28, 1577. Immediately Geneva versions began to appear in folio and octavo. Of special significance was a large folio which was clearly intended for use in the churches, accompanied by a prayerbook in which the word "minister" was substituted for "priest", and references to the books from which they came were printed instead of the text of the Gospels and Epistles. Pollard thinks this shows that despite the suspension of Grindal, the "extremer Protestant party was very strong," and that "behind these ventures, for which Walsingham helped to find money, there was something more than ordinary trading."[85] Numerous other Geneva editions began pouring from the presses, until Barker was "awakened from his dream" when Whitgift succeeded Grindal as Archbishop of Canterbury. Barker was ordered to put in hand a smaller and larger edition of the Bishops' Bible.

---

[84] Butterworth, op. cit., p. 187.

Walsingham was Elizabeth's Secretary of State, and it was probably his influence that got Barker his license to print the Bible. One of the secretaries under Walsingham was Laurence Tomson, a fellow of Magdelen College, Oxford, and a member of Parliament. Tomson had undertaken a revision of the Geneva New Testament in accordance with the Greek text published by Beza, and in 1576, this revision of the Geneva text was published by Barker with an elaborate title, including the epithet, "Englished by L. Tomson". The Tomson version of the New Testament differed very little from the Geneva New Testament of 1560, but the annotations were completely revised, and the edition proved so popular that eventually over half the Geneva Bibles published subsequently included the New Testament according to Tomson's revision.[86]

---

[85] Pollard, op. cit., p. 43.

[86] Butterworth, op. cit., pp. 188-189.

During Whitgift's Archbishopric

In August of 1589, Barker secured a fresh patent from the Queen to print Bibles during his own lifetime and that of his son, Robert, and entrusted his Bible-printing subsequently to deputies until his death in 1599. Between 1589 and 1603, three more folio editions of the Bishops' Bible appeared, no quartos and only three or four octavos. Yet from the year 1575 onward, an average of three editions of the Geneva Bible was published a year, the majority of them in small sizes for private reading. Thus the Geneva Bible had gone through enough editions to make it easily accessible, and the quantity of the version on the market was such as to take a real hold on the English people.[87]

The popularity of the Geneva Bible did not set well with the new Archbishop. In his articles of 1583, Whitgift had aimed another heavy blow at the party so hostile to the Elizabethan settlement, when he ruled that, henceforth, the only translation of the Bible to be used in the public services of the church was that made by the Elizabethan bishops published in 1568.[88] But to his chagrin, the Bishops' Bible was slow in selling. Whitgift wrote to the Bishop of London:

---

[87] Pollard, op. cit., p. 44.

[88] Philip Hughes, The Reformation in England, Revised Edition, Three Volumes in One (London: Burns and Oates, 1963), Vol. III, p. 228.

> Whereas I am credibly informed that divers, as well parish churches, as chapels of ease, are not sufficiently furnished with Bibles, but some have either none at all, or such as be torn and defaced, and yet not of the translation authorized by the synods of bishops: these are therefore to require you strictly in your visitations, or otherwise, to see that all and every the said churches and chapels in your diocese be provided of one Bible, or more, at your discretion, of the translation allowed as aforesaid, and one book of Common Prayer, as by the laws of this realm is appointed.[89]

But the Bishops' Bible had simply been replaced in the hearts of the people by the Geneva Bible, and although it was a superior translation, it was obvious to Elizabeth that the notes and annotations were tainted with teachings akin to Calvin and Knox, both of whom she detested, and the latter's *First Blast against the Monstrous Regiment of Women* still rankled in her mind. She would not favor this kind of Protestantism to spite Rome, Spain or France.[90]

The Popularity of the Geneva Bible

It was probably the annoyance of reading one Bible in church and another at home that caused the Puritans to demand a new translation of James I at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604. The spokesman for the Puritans was Dr. John Reynolds, President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, who requested a version of the Bible which would command the assent of the whole church.[91] William Barlow has given the "sum and substance" of the Conference.[92]

---

[89] Text in Pollard, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

[90] Hoare, *op. cit.*, p. 225.

Hampton Court Conference

Reynolds contended that the Bibles allowed in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI "were corrupt and not aunswerable to the truth of the Originall."[93] The Bishop of London, Richard Bancroft, retorted that if every man's "humour should be followed, there would be no ende of translating." Nevertheless the King expressed his desire for a uniform translation, for the Geneva translation was the "worst of all" versions in existence. He specified that the new version should have no annotations or marginal notes, "hauing found in them which are annexed to the Geneua translation . . . some notes very partiall, vntrue, seditious, and sauouring too much, of daungerous, and trayterous conceites." Explaining that the King had received a Geneva Bible from an English lady,[94] Barlow depicts several passages which were especially distasteful to the King. Exodus 1:19 is cited as allowing "disobedience to Kings." The note on 2 Chronicles 15:16 was distasteful because it "taxeth Asa for deposing his mother, onely, and not killing her."

---

[91] Pollard, op. cit., p. 44.

[92] William Barlow, The Summe and Substance (Gainsville, Florida: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1965), pp. 45-48.

[93] He cited as examples Gal. 4:25 and the true meaning of συστοιχεῖ, and several passages in the Psalms (105:28; 106:30).

[94] Luther Weigle calls this "sheer nonsense" since it was the version the King had been raised on. "Either he has been misrepresented or he was telling an unblushing falsehood." Weigle, The English New Testament (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1950), p. 18.

Reynolds' objections seem to have been made in the context of his objections to the Book of Common Prayer. In fact, S. L. Greenslade believes that Reynolds was only making a move in opposition to the Prayerbook itself in these objections, and would have been content if the Geneva Bible had been authorized.[95] But the King James Authorized Version came from the presses in 1611.

Examples of Printings and Usages

The story of the popularity of the Geneva Bible is quite amazing. More editions of the Geneva version were printed in 1611, another folio in 1612, three quartos in 1614, two more quartos in 1615 and a folio in 1616.[96] After this, although for another fifteen or twenty years eminent ecclesiastics, ordained before 1611, continued to take into the pulpit their old Geneva pocket editions, marked and familiar to their hands, the King's printers were encouraged to print no more Geneva Bibles.[97] Yet it is estimated in the Historical Catalogue of Bibles in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society that between 1560 and 1644, at least 140 editions of the Geneva Bible or Testament appeared.[98] Between 1642 and 1715, at least five editions of the King James Version were supplied with the Geneva notes, and thus the marginal notes continued to exercise a most profound influence on the theological and ecclesiastical history of England and Scotland for the next two or three generations.[99] Most of these editions were published in Holland. John Dore saw evidence of Authorized Versions with Geneva notes as late as 1810.[100] Nicholas Pocock, writing in 1883, thought these extraordinary editions show "how deeply seated" the "anti-Roman and Calvinistic feeling" was among English Bible reading people long after the Restoration, or even the Revolution of 1688.[101]

---

[95] S. L. Greenslade, "English Versions of the Bible, 1525-1611," The Cambridge History of the Bible, S. L. Greenslade, ed. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1963), p. 164.

[96] See Darlow and Moule, op. cit., pp. 132-149.

The popularity of the Geneva Bible in Elizabethan England is attested by the fact that during her twenty-eight year reign the Queen could not prevent it from being printed or read in the churches. Parker admitted that the Geneva Bible was being read in the churches of his day. Whitgift, in 1587, noted a similar growth in popularity although the Geneva version was never authorized by the Queen.[102] Gervase Babington, a pupil of Whitgift who preached his funeral sermon, successively Bishop of Llandaff, Exeter, and Worcester, and a member of the Hampton Court Conference, in his "Comfortable Notes on the Pentateuch," as well as his other expositions and sermons before the Court at Greenwhich and Paul's Cross in 1591, uniformly used the Geneva Bible as well as reading his text from it. George Abbot, the successor of Bancroft and predecessor of Laud, when Master of University College, Oxford, under Elizabeth and Whitgift, not only preached, but published in 1600, his sermons upon Jonah, and throughout he used the Geneva version.[103] Between Grindal's appointment as archbishop in 1575, and the Conventicle Act of 1593, which marks Whitgift's victory over the "Geneva party", there were forty-two editions of the Bible, thirty-three of which were of the Geneva version. And, in the last ten years of Elizabeth's reign, the years when Whitgift was triumphant, there were thirty-five editions of the Bible in all: another thirty-three of the Geneva version, and only two of the version officially sanctioned and imposed for public use, i.e. the Bishops' Bible. Of the fifty-eight editions that appeared between the ruling of 1583, officially sanctioning the Bishops' Bible, and the end of the reign, fifty-one were of the disapproved Geneva Bible, and only seven of the quasi-official Bishops' Bible.[104] And, perhaps most paradoxical of all, Archbishop Whitgift, in his Defence of the Answer to the Admonition Against the Reply of Thomas Cartwright, constantly alludes to and quotes the Geneva Bible.[105] Whitgift chided Cartwright for not adopting the theology involved in those marginal notes which militated against some of the issues Cartwright had advocated, yet the Archbishop took great pains to find those passages and notes which endorsed his own points, and showed no reluctance in using them.

---

[97] Pollard, op. cit., p. 73.

[98] Darlow and Moule, op. cit., p. 61.

[99] Metzger, Theology Today, loc. cit.

[100] Dore, op. cit., p. 205.

[101] Nicholas Pocock, "Some Notices on the Genevan Bible," The Bibliographer (July, 1883), p. 34.

---

[102] See above, p. 30f.

[103] Anderson, op. cit., p. 465.

In an article on the authorization of the English Bible in Macmillan's Magazine for October, 1881, the then Archbishop of Canterbury, R. T. Davidson, showed that the Geneva Bible was used by Bishop Lancelot Andrews in sermons preached in 1618, 1622, 1623 and 1624; by Bishop

---

[104] Hughes, op. cit., p. 229. See Darlow and Moule, op. cit., pp. 97-124.

[105] The Works of John Whitgift, edited for the Parker Society by John Ayre (Cambridge: The University Press, 1851), Vol. I, pp. 203, 294; Vol. II, pp. 524, 12-13, 26, 276-277, 410; Vol. III, pp. 81, 228, 514.

Laud in 1621; by Bishop Carleton in 1624; by Bishop Hall in 1613 and 1624; and, by Dean Williams in 1624. In Hall's Meditations the headings are from the A.V. but the quotations are "almost always from the Geneva." The Archbishop examined more than fifty sermons preached between 1611 and 1630, and found that the texts of twenty-seven were taken from the Geneva Bible and only five were taken from the Bishops' Bible.[106] In addition, the reviser of Westcott's book, W. A. Wright, made an independent examination of the sermons of Bishop Andrews, ranging from 1589-1624, and discovered that "a very large majority of his texts were taken from the Geneva Bible," and that "though he was one of the translators of the Authorized Version he seldom preached from it."[107] John Eadie discovered that Dr. Walter Balcanquall, Dean of Rochester, in a sermon preached before the King and published by the King's command in 1632, used the Geneva Bible. John Hales of Eton often quoted from it. Dr. Skinner, in succession Bishop of Bristol, Oxford, and Worcester, did the same in two sermons published by royal command in 1634. Dr. Richard Montagu, Bishop of Norwich, and a great favorite of King James, often quoted from the Geneva version in his Acts and Monuments of the Church, published in 1642. The same practice was usually followed by Bishop Overall, one of King James' translators, in his "Convocation Book," which, when first printed in 1689, carried the license of Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury. Another translator on King James' committee by the name of Dillingham continued to quote from the Geneva version after 1611.[108] Even the translators of the Authorized Version quoted from the Geneva Bible in their introduction entitled, "The Translators to the Reader".[109]

---

[106] Randall T. Davidson, "The Authorisation of the English Bible," Macmillan's Magazine (October, 1881), p. 441f.

[107] Westcott, op. cit., p. 107.

The popularity of the Geneva Bible is further evident in the Soldiers' Pocket Bible, issued in 1643 for the use of Oliver Cromwell's army. This Bible consisted of a selection of extracts from the Geneva version.[110] Eadie contends that when the Huguenot town of Orange was taken by Catholic troops, "ladies of good birth were given up to soldiery," and then "left in the streets without clothing, or their naked bodies were pasted over with leaves torn from their Geneva Bibles."[111]

Soon after its publication the Geneva Bible came into general use in Scotland. Knox followed Tyndale's translation in some of his earliest works, but after 1560, he adopted the Geneva version, and so did the other Presbyterian Divines. It was the first Bible printed in Scotland, all other English versions having been imported. No other edition of the Bible was published for thirty years, or until 1610. An act of Parliament required "every household worth 300 merks of yearly rent, and every yeoman or burgess worth £500 stock was to have a Bible and Psalm Book in the vulgar language, under penalty of ten pounds."[112] MacGregor maintains that the first generation of Scotsmen to enjoy the benefits of the Reformation were nurtured exclusively on the Geneva Bible.[113] Even as late as 1674, it was reported that at Kintore, in Aberdeenshire, there was a Bible "for public reading in the church, but of the old translation, therefore it is recommended to cause provide one of the new translation."[114] The "old translation" doubtless was the Geneva version, and the "new translation," the Authorized Version of 1611.

---

[108] Eadie, op. cit., p. 38.

[109] Lewis Lupton, A History of the Geneva Bible (London: The Fauconberg Press, 1966), Vol. I, p. 19.

[110] Bruce, op. cit., p. 92.

[111] Eadie, loc. cit.

It was chiefly owing to the dissemination of copies of the 1560 edition of the Geneva Bible that a "sturdy and articulate Protestantism was created in Britain, a Protestantism which made a permanent impact upon Anglo-American culture."[115] Indeed, the popularity of this amazing Bible made its way to the New World on the *Mayflower*.

---

[112] Herbert Gordon May, Our English Bible in the Making (Philadelphia: The Westminister Press, 1952), pp. 44-45.

[113] Geddes MacGregor, The Bible in the Making (New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1959), p. 134.

[114] Bruce, op. cit., p. 92.

Stages of Development of the Geneva Bible

The foregoing historical sketch of the Geneva Bible has uncovered various stages of development through which the Geneva version passed from its inception in 1557 until 1599, the year Christopher Barker, sole printer and publisher of the Geneva Bible in England during most of Elizabeth's reign, died. Therefore, the following stages should be distinguished.

(1) William Whittingham's New Testament, printed in Geneva in 1557.

(2) The 1560 edition of the whole Bible, printed in Geneva.

(3) The revision of Laurence Tomson of the Geneva New Testament of 1560, which was subsequently published with the Geneva Old Testament of 1560.

(4) Tomson's revision with another translation and marginal notes on Revelation.

(5) The publication of the Geneva Bible in England during Barker's printing privileges.

Since the first two stages have been adequately delineated, it remains to treat briefly the last three stages.

---

[115] Metzger, *Theology Today*, *loc*. *cit*.

Tomson's Revision

From 1576, the first year Tomson's revision of the New Testament appeared,[116] until 1587, the Tomson edition had been printed separately. However, the popularity of the edition demanded its subsequent publication with the Geneva Old Testament of 1560. Because there is little difference between the text of the 1560 New Testament and Tomson's revision, the popularity was doubtless due to the revision of the marginal notes.[117] What little difference there is in the text is due wholly to Beza's 1556 New Testament, and many of the alterations of translation had been anticipated by the Bishops' revision of 1572, also based on Beza's work.[118] Butterworth suggests that on occasion Tomson's revision even went back to Whittingham's 1557 Testament.[119]

Tomson, reputed one-time lecturer of Hebrew at Geneva,[120] and knower of twelve languages,[121] confessed his dependence on Beza in the preface to his edition. The notes appended to his translation are taken largely from Beza's readings and interpretations from his Greek and Latin version. Greenslade represents an overwhelming consensus among historians in saying that the notes of Tomson's revision "do indeed strengthen the Calvinist flavour, and not only in the matter of predestination."[122] Even the matter of church polity becomes more central. Pope calls them "violently anti-Catholic,"[123] and Pocock compares them with the Geneva notes, which he finds relatively harmless though still tainted with "Calvinism". Pocock concludes that the Beza annotations are "distinctly controversial" and Tomson's selection from them was intended to "educate people in Calvinistic doctrine, and to supply them with answers to objections which might be urged against it."[124]

---

[116] See Darlow and Moule, op. cit., p. 83.

[117] Nicholas Pocock, "The Genevan Bible with Tomson's New Testament," The Saturday Review (November 27, 1880), pp. 670-672.

[118] Butterworth, op. cit., p. 189.

[119] Ibid.

[120] Pope, op. cit., p. 230.

[121] Moulton draws attention to an inscription on a marble tablet in Chertsey Church. See p. 167.

Tomson's notes are much more numerous on the New Testament than the Geneva notes of 1560. He did not use the "Arguments" of the 1560 version except in Hebrews, which is abridged from the Genevan, yet he omitted the apology for not calling Hebrews the work of Paul. There are only a few notes on Revelation, Tomson apologizing for their omission, and promising "in the mean season" to take the matter up again. Then follows six pages of arguments for the authenticity of Revelation.[125] Pocock contends the notes in the Tomson revision are a combination of Beza's and his own: those which are in Roman type are for the most part Beza's, or translated from Beza's marginal annotations, and those in italics are Tomson's own.[126]

---

[122] Greenslade, op. cit., p. 158. Cf. Tomson's notes on Eph. 4:11 and 1 Tim. 5:17 with those of the Geneva edition of 1560. Cf. also Mt. 16:18; 1 Cor. 9:27; Rom. 9:20; 9:15, 17.

[123] Pope, op. cit., p. 231.

[124] Pocock, op. cit., Saturday Review (Nov. 27, 1880), p. 671.

From 1587-1616 the amalgamated Geneva edition began to appear (under the same printer's name in all the editions) in rapid fashion, although the first amalgamated edition appeared in 1578.[127] During these years the "pure Geneva version" and the amalgamated version appear in about equal numbers, although there seems to have been a few more of the latter. Usually, the amalgamated editions were Roman-type quartos and the 1560 edition appeared in black-letter type. The amalgamated editions had a curious table of the prohibitions of marriage arranged in two parallel columns at Leviticus 18:6, taken from the Bishops' Bible of 1568.

---

[125] Nicholas Pocock, "Laurence Tomson's New Testament," The Saturday Review (November 6, 1880), p. 575.

[126] Ibid.

[127] Darlow and Moule, op. cit., p. 102.

Tomson's Revision of Revelation

Beginning in 1594, another amalgamated edition appeared which had both an appended translation and set of marginal notes on the book of Revelation.[128] At the end of Tomson's edition, between the last page of Revelation and the "Brief Table" which usually followed, are inserted twenty-two pages of another translation of Revelation with copious annotations by Franciscus Junius. This edition of Revelation was translated into English in 1592. Junius, a Huguenot divine, is best known as the joint author with Emmanuel Tremellius of a Latin version of the Old Testament first published in 1579. In 1599, an amalgamated edition appeared without Tomson's translation and notes on the Revelation, but with Junius' translation and notes. Pocock believes that this translation by Junius varies almost in every verse from any known version, and was made with the help of Beza's Latin text. The notes are quite numerous, those of Beza being first, in italics, followed by those of Junius, in Roman type. The references to the notes of Beza are indicated by means of letters, and those of Junius, by means of arabic numerals. The editions which were amalgamated containing Junius' notes on Revelation appeared in several editions of the Geneva Bible, but after 1601, the notes were arranged in different order, those of Beza being interspersed with those of Junius. They were distinguished by letters of reference, though not always by a difference in type.[129] Pocock says the notes on Revelation "differ entirely from those of the Genevan version, though their animus as against Rome is pretty much the same."[130] The editions of 1599 and subsequent editions have the prefix to the Revelation which depict "The order of time whereunto the Contents of this booke are to be referred," containing a time table[131] showing evidence of what is generally called the "continuous-historical" method of interpreting the book of Revelation.

---

[128] _Ibid_., pp. 110-114.

During Barker's Printing Monopoly

When Barker first began publishing the Geneva Bible in 1575, the editions were the same as those which came from the Geneva presses in 1560 and 1570. However in the folio edition of 1578, Barker included an amended prayerbook which formed part of the book. In this prayerbook the word "priest", in the few places of the Elizabethan Prayerbook in which it had been left, was altered to "minister". It also omitted the offices of the private baptism of infants and confirmation.

---

[129] Pocock, op. cit., Saturday Review (November 27, 1880), p. 671.

[130] Ibid. Pope believes there is a greater "anti-Rome" motif in this edition. See p. 231.

[131] Pocock, ibid.

There was another curious insertion into Geneva Bibles after 1579. Robert F. Henry's two indices, one of which was entitled "How to take Profit in Reading the Holy Scriptures," calling attention to doctrinal texts where such words as "election" and "predestination" occurred, with a preface to the Christian reader, dated December 22, 1578, in which the writer hoped that his readers and he would "bring forth such fruits as may declare our undoubted election in Jesus Christ," began to appear in many editions printed by Barker.[132] Many of Barker's editions included thirty-one pages giving "The Geneologies Recorded in the Sacred Scripture, according to every Family and Tribe. With the Line of our Savior Jesus Christ observed from Adam to the blessed Virgin Mary". Several maps and descriptions of Canaan were often included.[133]

Also in 1579, an edition was published by Barker which had a catechism, framed by a person unknown,[134] entitled _Certain Questions and Answeres touching the doctrine of Predestination, and the Use of God's Word and_

---

[132] _Ibid_.

[133] Pope, _op_. _cit_., p. 233.

[134] Strype says such an edition appeared in 1582, and attributed the authorship of the Catechism either to Cartwright or Travers. See his _Annals of the Reformation_ (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1824), Vol. III, Part One, p. 226f.

Sacraments. Strype believed that the doctrines of "absolute election" and "election" were asserted in the leaves of this catechism. These "Questions and Answers" appear in every quarto edition of the Geneva Bible published by the Queen's or King's officially commissioned printer from 1579-1615. After 1615, they begin to disappear, probably the first sign of the rising influence of the future Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud.[135]

Conclusion: The Controversy over the Geneva Bible

That the Geneva Bible had a profound effect on the lives of Tudor-Stuart Englishmen hardly seems refutable. The popularity of this amazing edition was principally due to the marginal notes, prefaces and annotations which comprised such an integral part of the Bible itself. But what did the notes contain which contributed such an important role in the thinking of Anglican and Nonconformist alike? Was there an inherent theology adumbrated in the annotations?

The answers to these questions vary with interpreters. A current church historian suggests the "Argument" prefacing Romans "reflects Calvinistic theology."[136] John Dore, writing toward the close of the nineteenth century, is more straight-forward:

---

[135] Nicholas Pocock, "The Breeches Bible," The Saturday Review (September 25, 1880), p. 395.

[136] Carl S. Meyer, "The Geneva Bible," Concordia Theological Monthly (March, 1960), p. 139f.

> It is to teaching like that of the Genevan Bible, that no guide is necessary in spiritual matters, that we are indebted for the many different sects that divide the people of England, and embitter our social and political life.[137]

A Catholic historian contends that the notes are "distinctly Calvinistic," to the same degree that Tyndale's notes were Lutheran, and that if it were John Foxe's immensely popular Book of Martyrs that finally made the Englishman "anti-Catholic almost by nature," it was the Geneva Bible that made the religious Englishman, also, by nature, "anti-sacerdotal, a Low Churchman if not a Free Churchman."[138] William Whitley, who specialized in the study of the English Bible in Tudor England, suggests that the Geneva Bible was issued four years before the death of Calvin, "and its abundant notes set forth his doctrines so well that all Britain was soon Calvinist."[139]

Even the famous Gregory Martin-William Fulke debate was concerned with certain aspects of the Geneva Bible. Martin contended that there were some deliberate mistranslations in the Geneva Bible, and that in following Beza, the translators erred in the translation of such sacrosanct terms as "tradition", "idols", "church", "priesthood", and "penance". He complained the translators tried to eliminate traditional teachings on purgatory, limbo, the descent of Christ into hell, justification, merits, free will and penance. The translators perverted the sections in the book of Acts by their interest in presbyterian church government.[140]

---

[137] Dore, op. cit., p. 229.

[138] Hughes, op. cit., p. 230.

[139] William T. Whitley, The English Bible Under the Tudor Sovereigns (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, Ltd., n.d.), p. 105.

Other interpreters fail to see the Geneva Bible as a "Calvinistic manifesto". John Eadie portrays the theology of the version as merely reflecting the theology of the "favourite creed of the time," only a fraction of the notes being decidedly Calvinistic. He characterized only ten of the 250 notes in Romans as "Calvinistic".[141] Westcott, a scholar of considerable reputation, could find only slight "tinges of Calvinism" in the notes, yet on the whole the theology was neither "unjust nor illiberal."[142] John T. McNeill discounts the usual notion that the theology of the Geneva Bible reflects Calvin's true teachings. Both Knox and Goodman, whose work was prefaced by Whittingham, embarrassed him with their tracts on political resistance.

---

[140] Pope, op. cit., pp. 281-284. See William Fulke, A Defence of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holy Scripture into the English Tongue, edited for the Parker Society by Charles H. Hartshorne (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1843), pp. 154-155.

[141] Eadie, op. cit., p. 28.

[142] Westcott, op. cit., p. 93.

The notes attest "in their headlong and sweeping rejection of unscriptural rites and ceremonies" and in their "animus against episcopacy" a practical radicalism that is in distinct contrast with "Calvin's conciliatory attitude in his correspondence with Anglicans."[143]

But whatever the judgment might be regarding the theology inherent within the notes of the 1560 Geneva Bible it is generally recognized that this version contributed more to the composition of the Authorized Version of 1611, perhaps with the exception of the work of William Tyndale, than any other English version of the Bible. Butterworth calls it "the most important single volume in the lineage of the King James Version of the Bible."[144] But no judgment regarding the theology of the Geneva Bible is justifiable until the groundwork of extensive examination of its marginal notes and annotations is first completed.

---

[143] John T. McNeill, The History and Character of Calvinism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 312.

[144] Butterworth, op. cit., p. 163.

CHAPTER II

A CATEGORIZATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DOCTRINES OF THE GENEVA BIBLE OF 1560[1]

It is imperative for an understanding of the theology of the Geneva Bible to study the prefaces, "Arguments", and annotations. When this has been accomplished various doctrines may be categorized as having been chief theological concerns of the translators, and an analysis of each of the doctrinal categories should show the basic theological intentions of the exiles who compiled the annotations. This chapter will not be strictly interpretative, although some interpretation is obviously inescapable, but will seek to present the "raw material" of the annotations in a light which should provide a more historical reflection of what the compilers actually *said*.

Doctrine of God

The doctrine of God in the annotations of the

---

[1] The 1560 edition of the Geneva Bible consulted in this analysis is one provided on microfilm by University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan, a facsimile of a Henry Huntington Library possession. Since there is separate pagination for each the Old and New Testaments, folio numbers will indicate where possible the proper scriptural reference on which the compilers made the comment.

Geneva Bible is not highly developed into a refined theological system. God is mainly portrayed as a loving father to his chosen elect and a wrathful judge to the reprobate. Overriding all motifs, God is utterly separate and transcendent. His eternal counsel and will are immutable and unalterable. Nothing should be attributed to fortune, for all things are "determined in the counsel of God which shal come to passe."[2] Thus God cannot change or repent as is sometimes implied in the scriptures; from the human point of view it just appears that he does "when anie thing goeth contrary to his temporal election."[3]

It is clear that in the annotations the doctrine of God is interwoven with the doctrine of predestination. God appoints his ministers even before they are born.[4] He does not open all men's minds to understand his mysteries,[5] but in the case of Paul, as with all the elect, God first appointed the apostle in his eternal counsel, then from his mother's womb, and finally in his calling.[6] But God does not only choose men by adoption. He also calls countries "where his worde shalbe preached, and onely as he wil."[7]

---

[2] Prov. 16:33, fol. 272, recto.

[3] 1 Sam. 15:10, fol. 127, verso.

[4] Jer. 1:5, fol. 306, recto.

[5] Mk. 4:9, fol. 18, verso.

[6] Gal. 1:15, fol. 87, verso.

[7] Acts 16:6, fol. 62, verso.

Thus, "to whome God giueth his Spirit of adoption, and whome he calleth effectually, he can not perish: for Gods eternal counsel neuer changeth."[8]

Because of the strong character of the doctrine of predestination, God appears like a "deuouring fire" to carnal men, but to them that are drawn by his Spirit he is like a "pleasant Saphir."[9] Although God has "infideles" among his children[10] there is a clear distinction between the chosen and the reprobate. God will be merciful to the sinner, and he would rather pardon than punish him.

> Albeit God in his eternal counsel appointed the death and damnation of the reprobat, yet the end of his counsel was not their death only, but chiefly his own glorie. And also because he doeth not approue sinne, therefore it is . . . said that he wolde haue them to turne awaie from it that they might liue.[11]

The reprobate may live long and prosper, but God will punish him in his own due time. In fact, he will experience everlasting death even in this life.[12] His heart is hardened and his eyes blinded so that he cannot discern God's immutable will.

On the other hand, the elect are often led into cases of "extreme necessitie" in order that when their father gives aid to them they will praise his mercy to a greater degree.[13] Nevertheless, just as Israel murmured against her Lord, so Christians today, in times of trouble and adversity, murmur and complain like "raging beastes" because they forget both their "duetie and contemne Gods appointment ouer vs."[14] But God is just and merciful; only his mercy allows his children to be just. And, when he allows his children to be tempted by the devil, he does so only for their own upbuilding and edification. Ultimately, "all things are gouerned by Gods prouidence for the profite of his Church."[15]

---

[8] Rom. 11:29, fol. 74, verso.

[9] Ex. 24:17, fol. 35, recto.

[10] 2 Kings 5:1, fol. 166, verso.

[11] Ezek. 18:23, fol. 341, recto.

[12] Is. 26:14, fol. 291, recto.

Doctrine of Man

Closely coordinated with the doctrine of God is the doctrine of man. The Geneva notes continue the stress on the divine sovereignty of God by depicting man as helpless and corrupt, unable to come to any knowledge of God without God first revealing himself. Man can "nether chose good, cleaue to Gods word, nor runne forwarde in his waie" except God first "make our hearts large to receiue his grace, & willing to obey."[16] This motif is especially apparent throughout the notes in Job, Psalms and many of the Prophetic Books of the Old Testament. The comment on Proverbs 16:9 is indicative of this motif: it is not within man himself to direct his own way, for he is "not able to remoue one fote except God giue force."[17]

---

[13] 2 Kings 4:2, fol. 165, verso.

[14] 1 Sam. 30:6, fol. 135, recto.

[15] Gen. 42:1, fol. 19, verso.

[16] Ps. 119:32, fol. 261, recto.

But how did man become this way? He was created in all righteousness and perfection.[18] However, when Adam sinned "all mankinde, as it were sinned when thei were as yet inclosed" in the first man's loins.[19] The original sin, the sin of Adam, is therefore the "fountaine of all sinnes."[20] The son inherits the sin of his father, so that all good intentions of man are corrupted, his mind full of darkness, in short, all that is begotten of man is sinful and filthy and must be mortified.[21] Only God can revive the hardness of man's heart due to his sinful state. An unusual comment appears on 2 Corinthians 3:3, where Paul speaks of the Christian being a letter of recommendation of his ministry, a letter not written on tables of stone, but on human hearts by the Spirit of God. The Geneva compilers are led to write the following:

> The hardnes of mans heart before he be regenerat, is as a stone table . . . but being regenerat by

---

[17] Fol. 272, recto.

[18] Gen. 1:26, fol. 1, verso.

[19] Rom. 5:14, fol. 72, recto.

[20] Jn. 1:29, fol. 42, verso.

[21] Gen. 17:10, fol. 7, recto.

> the Spirit of God, it is as softe as flesh, that the grace of the Gospel may be written in it, as in new tables. . . .[22]

Nevertheless the nature of the biblical material leads the Geneva compilers to develop in some places what would appear to be a contradiction of the foregoing motif. In the Gospels, the Jews are found at fault for not believing in Jesus, as if it were a matter of human responsibility and initiative. 2 Chronicles 10:15 is the occasion for this comment:

> Gods wil imposeth suche a necessitie to the second causes, that nothing can be done but according to the same, and yet mans wil worketh as of it selfe, so that it can not be excused in doing euil, by aledging that it is Gods ordinance.[23]

This is the only place in all the notes where any theoretical development of the interrelationship between God's will and man's freedom is noticeable. While the translators were mainly concerned about the first cause of upholding the divine sovereignty of God, they were able to discern a difficulty in maintaining this in the light of human freedom of choice. Rather than trying to resolve the difficulty, they merely affirmed both elements--the first cause, God's divine will, encompasses the second cause, man's freedom, so that both are held intact.

---

[22] Fol. 83, verso.

[23] Fol. 195, verso.

For the most part, however, God's divine sovereignty is the key element in the translators' doctrine of man. Human reason is often in discord with the ordinance of God. Though there may be some use of human reason,[24] it is limited in scope and extent. "Mans reason murmureth, when it considereth onely the signes and outwarde things & hathe not regarde to the worde of God, which is there conteined."[25] For it is the nature of man to be unable to "come nere vnto God, if he shulde appeare in his strength & ful maiestie," and so man must rely upon the mercy of a God who "submitteth him selfe to our capacitie" rather than his own reason and ability.[26]

Revelation

God reveals himself in two ways: in nature, including the "natural spark of divinity" in man, and in the "Word of God," which the translators took to be the sixty-six canonical books of the Bible.

God has always left his testimony with man. Even before the giving of the law to Moses God had not left himself without witness in the hearts of his people. There is "euer some sede of the knollage of God in the heartes of the wicked."[27] There is a law "writen in mans heart" which teaches him that whoredom should be punished.[28] The heavens "are as a line of great capital letters to shewe vnto vs Gods glorie."[29] If man can see these few things daily with his eyes, how they declare God's great power and providence, "how muche more wolde they appeare, if we were able to comprehend all his workes?"[30]

---

[24] Job 10:12, fol. 225, verso.

[25] 2 Kings 5:11, fol. 166, verso.

[26] 1 Kings 19:11, fol. 161, verso. For a similar notion in Calvin, see H. Jackson Forstman, Word and Spirit: Calvin's Doctrine of Biblical Authority (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962), pp. 11-16.

Man can therefore see the handiwork of God in nature and come to a knowledge of God. Yet man has so many infirmities that a perfect knowledge of God is impossible for him. God must reveal himself in a special way. This he has done in his only begotten Son, Jesus Christ. Jesus spoke the wisdom of God on earth, and this wisdom was transmitted by the preaching of the apostles, a record of which men have in the scriptures. The translators therefore understood the "Word of God" as the Bible itself.

The Word of God is that which helps man to discern good from evil, knowledge from ignorance, light from darkness. Before the church undertakes anything it must first check with God's Word, then immediately put it into execution.[31] In the Preface to the Reader at the very beginning of this edition of the Bible, the reader is told why the compilers were making the edition available:

---

[27] Gen. 31:55, fol. 15, recto.

[28] Gen. 38:24, fol. 18, recto.

[29] Ps. 19, fol. 238, verso.

[30] Job 26:14, fol. 229, verso.

> . . . so you wolde willingly receyue the words of God, earnestly studie it and in all your life practise it, that you may now appeare in dede to be the people of God. . . .

No man has the authority to exceed the bounds of scripture, either to add to, or take from. They who "simply walke after Gods worde, haue no lets [nets] to intangle them, where as thei, that do contrary, are euer in nets and snares."[32] Whatever is not commanded by God's Word "touching his seruice, is against his worde."[33] Indeed, there is "no true Church but where as the people are taught by Gods pure worde."[34] Preachers of the Gospel "open the gates of heauen with the worde of God" which is the key Christ promised his apostles, but "where this worde is not purely taught, there is nether key, nor autoritie."[35] Nothing ought to be taught "which we haue not learned by Gods worde."[36]

---

[31] Preface to the Queen, fol. iii, recto.

[32] Ps. 119:45, fol. 261, recto.

[33] Jer. 19:5, fol. 314, verso.

[34] Mic. 4:2, fol. 375, recto.

[35] Mt. 16:19, fol. 19, recto.

[36] 1 Cor. 15:3, fol. 81, verso.

This theme will be found in an overwhelming majority of the footnotes. The emphasis is not so much on hearing the Word of God as the knowledge of it.[37] The "Word of God" has become a religious textbook for the English exiles, and in keeping with their own Protestant tradition, the Bible has become the measure of all religious thought and activity. Only the Bible is God's authority which contains norms for worship and piety. In fact, the Bible is the law of God. The comments on Matthew 5 clearly reveal how the scriptures are viewed.

> The Gospel is the stablishing & accomplishing of the law. . . . The doctrine of the Law conteineth nothing vnprofitable or superfluous. . . . Whosouer shal transgresse the least of the ten commandements in worde and example, he shal-be cast out of the kingdome of God, except it be pardoned him in Christ.[38]

Although Christ is the end of the law and the prophets,[39] the ten commandments, indeed, all the Old Testament, is inculcated with the New Testament into the rather amorphous "Word of God," so that it has become a new law, applicable to the sixteenth century just as it was in early centuries.

---

[37] For the distinction between Calvin's emphasis on hearing the Word and the characteristically English emphasis on understanding the Word, see below, p. 161f.

[38] Fol. 3, verso.

[39] Acts 7:37, fol. 57, verso.

The Word of God is frequently characterized as understandable only to the simple, poor people.[40] Paul's preaching the Gospel in "simplicitie" to the Corinthians was perverted by "worldly" and "wise" false teachers.[41] The scriptures are depicted as difficult to understand, but nevertheless capable of comprehension by all men, so that "the worde of God healeth when the vertue of the Spirit is ioyned with it," and "it is preached generally, that all might be inexcusable."[42] One gets the impression that the translators were working with the presupposition that the Holy Spirit witnesses internally within the heart of the reader as evidence that he is confronting God's Word, but the doctrine is nowhere developed or brought into the open.

Salvation

The doctrine of salvation which permeates many of the annotations is intrinsically tied together with both the doctrine of God and the doctrine of man. Thus there will be no surprise in finding that the doctrine of predestination is the center around which the doctrine of salvation is focalized.

---

[40] Lk. 10:21, fol. 33, verso.

[41] "Argument" to 1 Cor., fol. 76, verso.

[42] Acts 28:27, fol. 69, verso.

The notes in the Old Testament differ very little in theology and tone from those of the New Testament. At first this may seem insignificant, but a further look at the nature of the Old Testament materials, and yet another look at the texts where points of the doctrine of salvation are brought out, should convince the reader that the doctrine of salvation was certainly one of the main theological concerns of the translators. The statement in Genesis 1:12, "God saw it was good," evokes the following comment from the compilers:

> This sentence is so oft repeated, to signifie that God made all his creatures to serue his glorie, & to the profit of man: but for sinne thei were acursed, yet to the elect, by Christ they are restored & serue to their welth.[43]

Thus the compilers were especially interested in pointing out the nature of salvation. It was only by God's free election that the Israelites were chosen to be his people.[44] The hearts of the reprobate are hardened and the mercy of God does not pertain to them but only to the elect. The Spirit of God moves within the hearts of the elect but not within those of the reprobate, who are left to themselves.[45] The sinner cannot recognize his own evil, and his wickedness turns upon itself engendering more wickedness. This motif of God's determinate predestination is especially prevalent in the Psalms, where it reaches the point of a full-grown double predestination.

---

[43] Fol. 1, recto.

[44] 2 Sam. 7:24, fol. 139, recto.

[45] 2 Chron. 30:12, fol. 203, verso.

The notes in the New Testament continue the same motif. The "fanne" of Matthew 3:12 is the preaching of the Gospel, "whereby he gathereth the faithful as good corne, & scatereth the infideles as chaffe."[46] The passage in Matthew 25:34, where the shepherd tells his sheep of the kingdom "prepared from the foundations of the world," calls forth the following response from the translators: "Hereby God declareth the certeinetie of our predestination, whereby we are saued because we were chosen in Christ before the fundacions of the worlde."[47] No one can believe "but whome God doeth appoint before all beginnings to be saued."[48] The double predestination motif is clearest in the "Argument" of the Roman letter, where it is said that "of his fre mercie he electeth some to be saued, and of his iuste iudgement reiecteth others to be damned."[49]

The notion of salvation by grace through faith is subservient to the higher notion of God's divine sovereignty.

---

[46] Fol. 3, recto.

[47] Fol. 14, verso.

[48] Acts 13:48, fol. 61, verso.

[49] Fol. 70, recto.

> As the onelie wil & purpose of God is the chief cause of election & reprobacion: so his fre mercie in Christ is an inferior cause of saluacion, & the hardening of the heart, an inferior cause of damnacion.[50]

Thus the primary theological concern of the translators relative to the doctrine of salvation was the divine sovereignty and immutable will of the "eternal counsel" of God. It is God who initiates salvation. "Except God open our eies, we can nether se, nor vse the meanes which are before vs."[51] For those whose eyes the Lord does not open "can nether se his angre, nor his loue."[52] The hearts of men are in God's hands either to be made faint or bold. Man is deserving of nothing but God's anger, but if God spare any it is a sign of his infinite mercy.

The elect are made so by God's free act of mercy. If God chooses his Spirit to work in a certain man, that man responds with repentance. This is clearly seen in the case of Rahab, that "in this commune destruction he wolde drawe a moste miserable sinner to repent & confesse his Name."[53] Thus the initiative is God's to call sinners to repentance. The preaching of the Word is of no effect until God "touches the heart" to provoke faith and repentance.[54] Neither miracles nor the Word itself can move man to faith except God first touch his heart. Indeed, no man can call on God unless God first calls on him with his Spirit. This redemptive determinism is clearly seen in the following statements:

---

[50] Rom. 9:15, fol. 73, verso.

[51] Gen. 21:19, fol. 9, recto.

[52] Num. 22:31, fol. 72, verso.

[53] Josh. 2:11, fol. 97, recto.

> Faith cometh not of mans wil or power, but by the secret illumination of God, which is the declaration of his eternal counsel.[55]
> God doeth regenerate his elect, & causeth them to obey the Gospel.[56]

Faith then is the gift of God. But it is given by God of his own free mercy and not by any work of merit on the part of man. No one could fully obey the law, and man's only recourse was justification by faith through Christ. This is what took place in the life of Abraham.[57] This is also true in the case of Josiah, who, because he saw the great plagues of God threatening the people, knew "no more spedie waye to auoide them, then to turne to God by repentance, which can not come but of faith. . . ."[58] Man's sinfulness makes his endeavors "farre vnperfite" but salvation comes by grace wherein God accepts man's imperfection.[59] Thus to be "iustified by faith, is to haue our sinnes frely remitted, and to be reputed iust."[60] A note in the Song of Solomon succinctly epitomizes this motif which runs like an unbroken thread throughout the annotations on the Old Testament: the church or the "Spouse" of Christ "shall not finde him if she think to annoint him with her good workes."[61]

---

[54] 2 Chron. 33:10, fol. 205, recto.

[55] Mt. 11:26, fol. 7, recto.

[56] Jn. 6:37, fol. 45, verso.

[57] The summary of Genesis 15 says Abraham was "iustified by faith", fol. 6, verso.

[58] 2 Kings 23:1, fol. 176, recto.

The New Testament offers more fertile ground for this characteristically Protestant motif. The translators seem almost defensive at passages which might indicate a shade of the notion that man can work for his salvation. An example can be seen in the "Parable of the Sheep and the Goats" in Matthew 25, in which the righteous sheep are depicted as feeding the hungry and clothing the needy. The translators offer rather apologetically,

> Christ meaneth not that our saluation dependeth on our workes or merites, but teacheth what it is to liue iustly according to godlines, & charitie, and that God recompenseth his of his fre mercie, likewise as he doeth elect them.[62]

Man is thus declared just and righteousness is imputed to him. God accepts him in spite of his imperfections, as if his faith in Christ were not weak and imperfect.[63]

---

[59] Ps. 19, fol. 238, verso.

[60] Ps. 32:1, fol. 241, recto.

[61] 5:5, fol. 281, verso.

[62] Fol. 14, verso.

[63] Lk. 8:48, fol. 32, recto.

But to join the faith which justifies with justification by the law or human works is to join light with darkness, death with life, utterly undermining the true Gospel of Jesus Christ.[64]

The law, however, is not destroyed. When Romans depicts the law as "killing", it refers to the "Law of it selfe without Christ."[65] The law does not make us guilty, but shows our guilt before God, which is therefore deserving of condemnation.[66]

> The Law of faith is the Gospel which offreth saluation with condition (if thou beleuest) which condition also Christ frely giueth to vs. So the condition of the Law is (if thou doest all these things) the which onely Christ hathe fulfilled for vs.[67]

It was impossible for man to fulfill the law because of his corruption. But faith becomes the "ornament of the Law" for in it Christ makes men of faith fulfillers of the law.[68] Thus the doctrine of the law is not abolished, but "the condemnation thereof is taken away by faith."[69]

Faith as a concept must show itself in works. It was not enough for Abraham to worship God in his heart, for it was "expedient to declare by outward profession his faith before men."[70] Throughout the annotations on the Old Testament true obedience is declared the result of a "liuely faith."[71] We must first have faith in order for our works to be pleasing to God, but "perfit obedience" must be rendered to God as a natural outgrowth of faith. This motif is a familiar one throughout the annotations of both Testaments: faith issues in charity.

---

[64] Gal. 1:7, fol. 87, verso.

[65] Rom. 2:27, fol. 71, recto.

[66] Rom. 3:19, ibid.

[67] Rom. 3:27, fol. 71, verso.

[68] Rom. 3:31, ibid.

[69] Gal. 3:25, fol. 88, verso.

The controversy involving the positions of Paul and James in the New Testament provides the compilers an opportunity to adumbrate their own position clearly. Paul, in Romans and Galatians, "disputeth against them, which attributed iustification to the workes." But James "reasoneth against them who vtterly condemn workes." Paul is showing the causes of our justification and James is showing the effects; the former how we are justified, the latter how we know we are justified.[72]

Clearly, the compilers tended toward a more moralistic view of faith, and here they were in company with their own English Protestant tradition rather than the more inclusive Lutheran position. For, when Paul talked of faith in his hymn to love in 1 Corinthians 13, characteristically the compilers confessed that faith which justifies cannot be separated from charity.[73]

---

[70] Gen. 12:7, fol. 5, verso.

[71] Gen. 22:12, fol. 9, verso.

[72] Jas. 2:14, fol. 107, verso.

There is some tendency within the notes to affirm the eternal security of the elect. Satan's power is limited in that he cannot hurt the elect to the point of destruction.[74] The Christian "can not be vnder the power of sinne because the Spirit of God correcteth his euil and corrupt affections."[75] Yet there are some notes which do not take a hard-line view (as would be found, e.g. in the statements of Dort), which leaves the impression that "Christians could be drawen back" into the world by evil examples, or that Satan could enter again into the hearts of the elect, "for since he was once mans olde gest, he knoweth euerie hole and corner of our house."[76] Nevertheless, the security of the elect is definitely a chief theological concern of one or more of the translators.

Ethics

Since the ethics developed by the compilers in the annotations must be understood in the context of their view of salvation, it should not be surprising to find them again in the tradition of English Protestantism. With the writings of Robert Barnes and William Tyndale familiar to them, the exiles developed an ethics which owes its origin to the sources of Erasmian humanism. Although they clung to the Lutheran doctrine of "justification by grace through faith" they seemed to link faith with a certain moralism and notion of Christian excellence which strove for culmination in the imitatio christi. The Preface to the Reader states,

---

[73] Fol. 81, recto.

[74] 2 Thess. 2:10, fol. 97, recto.

[75] Jn. 3:9, fol. 112, verso.

[76] Mt. 12:45, fol. 7, verso.

> Now forasmuche as this thing [i.e. the glory of God] chefely is atteyned by the knollage and practising of the worde of God (which is the light to our paths, the keye of the kingdome of heauen, our comfort in affliction, our shielde and sworde against Satan, the schoole of all wisdome, the glasse wherein we beholde Gods face, the testimonie of his fauour, and the only foode and nourishment of our soules) we thoght that we colde bestowe our labours & studie in nothing which colde be more acceptable to God and comfortable to his Churche then in the translating of the holy Scriptures into our natiue tongue. . . .

Thus there is an emphasis on a faith which expresses itself in good works. The faithful, by struggling, can overcome temptations,[77] for it is not simply a matter of hearing the Word, but of expressing it by "example of life."[78] The correct response to the grace of God is to "learne thereby to feare & serue him with an vpright conscience."[79] In the Psalms and Proverbs of the Old Testament there is a stress on "vpright liuing," for trusting in God and obeying his will are "sure tokens that his prouidence wil neuer faile vs."[80] The godly "increase in knowledge and perfection, til thei come to ful perfection, which is when thei shalbe ioyned to their head in the heauens."[81] The "Argument" of the Four Gospels says that Christians are admonished in these accounts "to forsake the worlde, and the vanities thereof, and with most affectioned hearts embrace this incomparable treasure frely offred vnto vs."[82] Throughout the annotations there is a stress on the chastity of both body and mind, often expressed in an overcoming and mortification of affections, in order to be true disciples of Christ.[83] When God's children strive for perfection God has promised them an inward peace in their consciences, "but outwardly we must haue warre with wicked worldelings."[84] The "Arguments" of Romans and 1 Peter further illustrate this motif. The former has instructions "of Christian maners" which teach

---

[77] Gen. 32:31, fol. 15, verso.

[78] Deut. 8:1, fol. 84, recto.

[79] Josh. 24:14, fol. 107, verso.

> euerie man to walke in roundenes of conscience in his vocation, with all patience and humblenes, reuerencing, and obeying the magistrate, exercising charitie, putting of the olde man, and putting on Christ, bearing with the weake, and louing one

---

[80] Ps. 37:3, fol. 242, recto.

[81] Prov. 4:18, fol. 268, recto.

[82] Fol. 2, recto.

[83] Mt. 7:13, fol. 5, recto.

[84] Mt. 10:34, fol. 6, verso.

> another according to Christs example.[85]

Peter, in the latter,

> exhorteth the faithful to denie them selves, and to contemne the worlde, that being deliuered from all carnal affections and impediments, they may more spedely atteine to the heauenlie kingdome of Christ,--whereunto we are called by the grace of God reveiled to vs in his Sonne, and haue already receiued it by faith, possessed it by hope, and are therein confirmed by holines of life.[86]

The "holines of life" doubtless meant different things to each of the translators. But all of them expressed a negative evaluation of such things as drunkenness, the excessive use of wine, "wanten dancing", the vanities of finery in jewelry and clothing and idolatry. For example, Lot's incestuous actions would not have happened had he not "been ouercome with wine."[87] The dances of Exodus 15:20 signified great joy in the customs of ancient peoples, "but it oght not to be a cloke to couer our wanten dances."[88] The beheading of John the Baptist is one of the "inconueniences of dancing."[89] When Rebecca was given bracelets and fine jewelry, the translators suggest that God permitted "manie things . . . which are nowe forbid: specially when thei apperteine not to our morificacion."[90] In Isaiah 3, the prophet depicts the loss of the prestige and honor of Judah. Among the losses are jewelry and fine clothing. The translators offer: "in rehearsing all these things particularly, he sheweth the lightnes & vanitie of suche as can not be content with comelie apparel according to their degre."[91] In addition, all superfluous oaths should be debarred, whether the name of God "be therein mencioned, or otherwise."[92] Christians should also keep a "straict [strict] dyet" and refrain "from such things as might distempre" their bodies.[93]

---

[85] Fol. 70, recto.

[86] Fol. 108, verso.

[87] Gen. 19:32, fol. 8, verso.

[88] Fol. 31, recto.

[89] Mk. 6:22, fol. 20, recto.

On the positive side, the annotations provide a clear picture of some of the ethical concerns of the translators. The order of nature provides that every one should provide for his own family,[94] and "when we are in necessitie or danger God forbiddeth not to vse all honest meanes to better our estate and condition."[95] A man should not steal, "but studie to saue his goods."[96] Handicrafts, of the kind that were involved in the building of the tabernacle, are "gifts of Gods Spirit, & therefore oght to be estemed."[97] God blesses those who are not idle.[98] Children of God should "sel not into det by vnthriftines or prodigalitie,"[99] but "come truely by our meat and drinke . . . and . . . distribute parte to the pore."[100]

---

[90] Gen. 24:22, fol. 10, verso.

[91] Is. 3:23, p. 284.

[92] Mt. 5:34, fol. 4, recto. Note that a similar injunction is found in the annotations on the Old Testament, but in the latter, swearing by God or God's name is the only kind of oath not forbidden. Cf. Gen. 21:24, fol. 9, recto, and Gen. 42:15, fol. 20, recto.

[93] Cor. 9:25, fol. 79, verso.

[94] Gen. 30:30, fol. 14, recto.

[95] Gen. 43:12, fol. 20, verso.

The translators were somewhat perplexed by the communism of the early Jerusalem church. They suggest that the goods were not all mingled together, but "suche order was obserued that euerie man frankely relieued anothers necessitie."[101] No man was compelled to sell his possessions, "nor to put his money to the commune vse."[102] But if there were some perplexity over the exchange of property in the early Jerusalem church in the minds of the translators, there was none regarding the use of money and goods in general. Throughout the annotations in both Testaments there is a definite anti-rich polemic, and an emphasis on giving and caring for the poor. Money should not be lent on interest[103] or "for gaine".[104] People in prosperity are prone to forget God.[105]

---

[96] Ex. 20:15, fol. 33, recto.

[97] Ex. 31:3, fol. 40, verso.

[98] Deut. 28:8, fol. 92, verso.

[99] 2 Kings 4:1, fol. 165, verso.

[100] Lk. 11:41, fol. 34, verso.

[101] Acts 2:45, fol. 55, recto.

[102] Acts 5:4, fol. 56, verso.

The question of war is decided fairly forthrightly. The Christian is not to engage in war, for the bearing of the sword is the responsibility of the civil magistrate. But in the event that God's people are in danger from attack, or "true religion" is in jeopardy of being perverted into idolatry, only then can the Christian take up arms.[106]

Among the primary ethical concerns of the translators is the matter of remaining free from worldly and idolatrous contamination. Throughout the annotations there is a certain "separatist" motif. God's children should not be unequally yoked with "infideles" in either marriage or any other relationship. Company with the wicked is dangerous.[107] Those "strangers" and "foreigners" and such as are not "of thy nacion" tend to "change true religion into idolatrie, and bring thee to slauerie."[108] Whoever is the enemy of God must also be the enemy of God's people.[109]

---

[103] Lk. 6:35, fol. 30, verso.

[104] Ps. 112:5, fol. 260, recto.

[105] Neh. 9:28, fol. 216, recto.

[106] Mt. 26:52, fol. 15, verso; Deut. 20:1, fol. 89, verso, 2 Sam. 10:12, fol. 139, verso.

[107] Gen. 14:12, fol. 6, verso.

Although the ethics uncovered in this categorization are not developed in any highly theoretical way by the compilers of the Geneva Bible, the comment on Amos 5:24 succinctly summarizes their overall view: "Do your duetie to God & to your neighbour, & so ye shal fele his grace plentifully, if you shewe your abundant affections according to Gods worde."[110]

The Church and History

There is one particular theme running throughout the notes of the Old Testament which is a distinctive feature of English Protestantism. It is the predominant motif in both Prefaces and it also will be found to a lesser degree in the notes on the New Testament. In this thesis it will be called the "Deuteronomic view of history".[111]

---

[108] Deut. 17:15, fol. 88, verso.

[109] Cf. O.T., fol. 173ff.

[110] Fol. 371, recto.

The English exiles looked upon the English Protestant Church as the People of God, a continuation of the "chosen people" concept in the Old Testament. They looked back into the history of Israel, and viewing themselves as the "New Israel," they felt they were beholding the parable of their own times. Just as God had freed historic Israel from the bonds of slavery and delivered them into the promised land, the exiles shared with other notable English reformers the notion that they had been delivered from the bonds of Catholicism and paganism to dwell in the land of promise, England. But both Israel and England had not carried reformation far enough and God was forced to break his covenant with them for their idolatry and apostasy. Judgment came to Israel through the prophets, and warnings were given through these spokesmen of God to the civil magistrates to renew spiritual vigor and establish again the "true religion" of Jahweh. In the same way, judgment will come upon the "New Israel" of England, unless they reform the nation and renew the "true religion" of the Protestants. Doubtless the exiles looked upon themselves as God's spokesmen to the nation and its civil leaders in a time of critical judgment. England must not go backward as in the reign of "Bloody Mary", but must turn its face Godward, seeking religious and spiritual renewal. If it fails to turn again to God and renew its covenant with him, England will be dispersed and condemned, and only the plight of an ancient Israel, dispersed in lands of paganism and idolatry, awaits it.

---

[111] The phrase "Deuteronomic view of history" is generally used in Old Testament studies in referring to the later work of the "Deuteronomist" who was supposed to have reworked many of the sources which the "Jahwist" had already used in his compilation of certain sections of the Pentateuch as well as other Old Testament material. The "Deuteronomist", in his rehearsal, incorporated into his work his own view of history, interpreting events as being either favorable or unfavorable to Israel in direct relation to her faithfulness to the covenant with God. The Geneva translators, in a similar manner, read into their work their own view of history, whereby the English nation, in covenant with God, would be blessed or cursed just as Israel, i.e. in direct correspondence with the nation's faithfulness and obedience to the laws of God.

These motifs characterize nearly all the "Arguments" prefacing the books of the Old Testament. The word "Church" is used to depict Israel, but the applications though not always specific, are clearly intended for the readers in England. This is brought out in no clearer place than in the Preface to the Queen. The Preface is dedicated to the "Moste Vertvovs and noble Qvene Elisabet, Quene of England, France, and Ireland" from "Your humble subiects of the English Churche at Geneua". The Queen is told that when Zerubbabel went about to build the temple he was faced with difficulties and hindrances. The People of God were "sore molested with foreyn aduersaries" but even at home the situation was rife with "domestical enemies, as false Prophets, craftie worldlings, faint hearted soldiers, and oppressors of their brethren." These have opposed the good work of the Lord and discouraged the hearts of the workers "so that the Lords worke was not only interrupted and left of for a long tyme, but scarcely at the length with great labour and danger after a sort broght to pass." But "how muche greater charge God hath laid vpon" the present Queen, Elizabeth, in making her "a builder of his spiritual Temple." The translators wanted to do their part to assist the Queen "whom God hath made as our Zerabbabel for the erecting of this most excellent Temple."

The Preface speaks of the enemies of Judah and Benjamin as being similar in their day to the enemies of "this building," some of which were papists, "who vnder pretence of fauoring Gods worde, traiterously seke to erect idolatrie and to destroy your maiestie." Some of the enemies are worldlings, some "ambicious prelats," who can "abide none but them selues," practicing "sedition to manteyne their errors." In order to build this building correctly it must be based upon the firm foundation of the Word of God, and thus, the translators were contributing their part by translating the scriptures into English.

But to lay the proper foundation the improper impediments must first be taken away. These impediments are the works of the aforementioned enemies. Thus it was

> necessarie that your graces zeale appeare herein, that nether the craftie persuasion of man, nether worldly policie, or natural feare dissuade you to

> roote out, cut downe and destroy these wedes and impedimentes which do not only deface your building, but vtterly indeuour, yea & threaten the ruine thereof.

God blessed King Josiah for uprooting the idolatry and sorcery of his day, even when he put to death the false prophets and sorcerers, "to performe the wordes of the Lawe of God."

> And if these zealous begynnings seme dangerous and to brede disquietnes in your dominions, yet by the storie of King Asa it is manifest, that the quietnes and peace of Kingdomes standeth in the vtter abolishing of idolatrie, and in aduancing of true religion: for in his dayes Iudah lyued in rest and quietnes for the space of fyue and thirtie yere, til at length he began to be colde in the zeale of the Lord, feared the power of man, imprisoned the Prophet of God, and oppressed the people: then the Lord sent him warres, & at length toke him away by death.

If God gave godly wisdom to the likes of Solomon and other builders of the temple, how much more will he give to the Queen "and other godly princes and chefe gouernours with a principal Spirit, that you may procure and commande things necessarie for this moste holy Temple." The examples of the righteous rules of such kings as Jehoshaphat, Josiah and Hezekiah should show other rulers that God brings blessings and honor to those countries which are so reformed and where the Word of God is established "with all spede, lest the wrath of the Lord fall vpon them for the neglecting thereof."

The manner of the building must be according to God's ways, not the ways of men. Moses could only build the tabernacle exactly according to the pattern God gave him, "nether to prescribe any other ceremonies & lawes then such as the Lord had expresly commanded."

Two things were necessary if England were to make of this temple a work of God's pleasure. First, "that we haue a lyuely & stedfast faith in Christ Iesus," and, second, "that our faith bring forthe good fruites, so that our godly conversation may serue vs as a witnes to confirme our election." Thus their lives and conduct had to agree with their profession. England is an example to all believers.

> For considering Gods wonderful mercies toward you at all seasons, who hath pulled you out of the mouthe of the lyons, and how that from your youth you haue bene broght vp in the holy Scriptures, the hope of all men is so increased, that they can not but looke that God shulde bring to passe some wonderful worke by your grace to the vniuersal comfort of his Churche.

God's kingdom, the church, will ultimately be victorious, and though things may seem bad at present the future holds the church's vindication. God punishes their enemies and nourishes and preserves them under his wings.

Finally, the Queen is the object of a prayer.

> The Lord of lordes & King of Kings who hath euer defended his, strengthen, comfort and preserue your maiestie, that you may be able to builde vp the ruines of Gods house to his glorie, the discharge of your conscience, and to the comfort of all them that loue the comming of Christ Iesus our Lord.

A similar motif will be found in the Preface to the Reader.

> Besides the manifolde and continual benefites which almightie God bestoweth vpon vs, bothe corporal and spiritual, we are especially bounde . . . to giue him thankes without ceasing for his great grace and vnspeakable mercies, in that it hath pleased him to call vs vnto this meruelous light of his Gospel, & mercifully to regarde vs after so horrible backesliding and falling away from Christ to Antichrist, from light to darcknes, from the liuing God to dumme and dead idoles, & that after so cruel murther of Gods Saintes, as alas, hathe bene among vs, we are not altogether cast of, as were the Israelites, and many others for the like, or not so manifest wickednes, but receyued agayne to grace with moste euident signes and tokens of Gods especial loue and fauour.

The Preface concludes,

> Therefore, as brethren that are partakers of the same hope and saluation with vs, we beseche you, that this riche perle and inestimable treasure may not be offred in vayne, but as sent from God to the people of God, for the increase of his kingdome, the comfort of his Churche, and discharge of our conscience, whome it hath pleased him to raise vp for this purpose, so you wolde willingly receyue the worde of God, earnestly studie it, and in all your life practise it, that you may now appeare in dede to be the people of God, not walking any more according to this worlde, but in the frutes of the Spirit, that God in vs may be fully glorified through Christ Iesus our Lord, who lyueth and reigneth for euer.

The "Argument" to the book of Exodus provides an example of how this motif is applied to the books of the Old Testament. The Lord had compassion on his church and delivered them, but plagued their enemies. The chosen people of God soon forgot God's wonderful deliverance, however, and God had to visit them with "sharpe roddes and plagues that by his corrections they might seke to him for remedy against his scourages & earnestly repent them for their rebellions & wickednes."[112] Therefore they are taught that they should serve God not after their own inventions, but according to "his heauenlie wisdom" which God hath appointed.[113] On folio 30, as an appendix to the events covered in Exodus, there is a woodcut showing the plight of the Israelites as they were being pursued to the Red Sea by Pharaoh's army. The circumscription reads:

> In this figure foure chief points are to be considered. First that the Church of God is euer subiect in this worlde to the Crosse & to be afflicted after one sort or other. The second, that the ministers of God following their vocation shalbe euil spoken of, and murmured against, euen of them that pretend the same cause and religion that thei do. The third, that God deliuereth not his Church incontinently out of dangers, but to exercise their faith and pacience continueth their troubles, yea and often tymes augmenteth them as the Israelites were now in lesse hope of their liues then when thei were in Egypt. The fourth point is, that when the dangers are moste great, then Gods helpe is moste ready to succour: for the Israelites had on ether side them, huge rockes & mountaines, before them the Sea, behinde them moste cruel ennemies, so that there was no way left to escape to mans iudgement.

It is this kind of theme which characterizes the majority of the annotations on the Old Testament, and in each case, it should be evident that the translators were viewing their own times and their own people as the symbolic benefactors of Israel's predicament.

---

[112] Fol. 24, recto.

[113] *Ibid.*

The "Argument" prefacing the book of Deuteronomy is also typical of the same theme. The "wonderful loue of God toward his Churche is liuely set forthe in this boke."[114] The church deserves to be cut off for their disobedience, but God preserved them for his mercy's sake, bringing them victoriously into the land of Canaan. The church's part is to obey his Word, for "by his worde he wolde be knowen to be their God, and they his people." By his Word he would govern his church, discern the false prophets from the true ones, error from knowledge, and "his owne people from all other nations and infideles."[115] For this purpose God promised to raise up "Kings and gouernours for the setting forthe of this worde and preseruacion of his Churche."[116] Therefore to be his people "thou must kepe his Lawes,"[117] and "all thine enterprises shal haue good success."[118]

There is nothing which "more prouoketh Gods wrath, then mans ingratitude, yet is there nothing so displeasant and heinous that can turne backe Gods loue from his Church."[119] But this is what Israel did, turning to

---

[114] Fol. 80, recto.

[115] _Ibid_.

[116] _Ibid_.

[117] Deut. 27:10, fol. 92, recto.

[118] Deut. 28:6, fol. 92, verso.

[119] "Argument" to Judges, fol. 108, recto.

"horrible obliuion of Gods graces" instead of grateful obedience. Thus they provoked the vengeance of God upon themselves. So God gave them signs of their confused state: he allowed them to be "cruelly vexed and tormented by tyrants: he pulled them from libertie, and cast them into slauerie."[120] Yet God showed himself a merciful God during the time of the Judges, for he sent them certain beneficent deliverers to take them out of oppression, in order to make them repent and turn to him. Thus the book of Judges offers two points for consideration: one, that "the battel that the Church of God hathe for the maintenance of true religion against idolatrie and superstition," and, two, "what great danger that commune wealth is in, when as God giueth not a magistrate to reteine his people in the purenes of religion and his true seruice."[121]

The period of the Kings of Israel shows "how that florishing kingdomes, except they be preserued by Gods protection . . . fall to decay and come to naught, "for God favors them when his Word is truly set forth, virtue esteemed, vice punished and concord maintained.[122] God's favor is showered upon those rulers and people "which obey his Prophetes and imbrace his worde," but contrarily, he brings "his plagues towardes those commune weales which neglect his ministers and do not obey his commandements."[123]

---

[120] Ibid.

[121] Ibid.

[122] "Argument" to 1 Kings, fol. 148, recto.

Yet even after the chosen nation of God was brought into captivity by her enemies, God provided them with persons to help them in time of need. The "Argument" to Esther states,

> Herein is declared the great mercies of God toward his Church: who neuer faileth them in their greatest dangers, but when all hope of worldely helpe faileth, he euer stirreth vp some, by whome he sendeth comfort, and deliuerance. Herein also is described the ambition, pride and crueltie of the wicked, when they come to honour, and their sodeyn fall when they are at highest: and how God preserueth, and preferreth them which are zealous of his glorie, and haue a care and loue towarde their brethren.[124]

So Israel perished but for a remnant because of their unfaithfulness and idolatry. Their affliction and destruction were due primarily to their leaders, those "gouernours, Prophetes, & pastors, whose ignorance, negligence, auarice & obstinacie" provoked the wrath of God against his once chosen people.[125] Yet God continued to show mercy by caring for his "Church", as even the Apocryphal Books show. God did not leave his people

---

[123] "Argument" to 2 Kings, fol. 164, recto.

[124] Fol. 218, verso.

[125] Is. 56:10, fol. 302, verso.

> vtterly destitute of teachers and meanes to confirme them in the hope of the promised Messiah, and also witnesse that those calamities that God sent to his Church, were according to his prouidence, who had bothe so threatened by his Prophetes, so broght it to passe for the destruction of their enemies, and for the tryal of his children.[126]

The lesson pertains not only to Israel and the church. The judgment of God on historic Israel serves as a lesson for all peoples, all countries. That the English exiles were thinking particularly of their own country is clear in the following comment on Jeremiah 44:9.

> He sheweth that we oght to kepe in memorie Gods plagues from the beginning that considering them, we might liue in his feare, and knowe if he haue not spared our fathers, yea, Kings, princes and rulers, and also whole countreis, and nations for their sinnes, that we vile wormes can not loke to escape punishment for ours.[127]

This "Deuteronomic view of history" is clearly one of the distinctive contributions of the Geneva exiles to English Protestantism. Along with William Tyndale and others, the exiles felt that England was in danger of God's wrath for not taking far enough the theology of the Reformation. England had paid a terrible price in Mary's reign; now hope dawned again when Elizabeth came to the throne. It was doubtless this hope which led the translators to conclude their task with a quotation from Joshua 1:8, a verse they literally took to heart. In very large letters, it read

---

[126] "Argument", fol. 386, recto.

[127] Fol. 326, recto.

> Let not this boke of the Law depart out of thy mouth, but meditate therein daye and night, that thou mayest obserue and do according to all that is written therein: so shalt thou make thy way prosperous, and then shalt thou haue good successe.

Doctrine of the State

As has already been shown, one of the accusations against the Geneva Bible was its prejudiced, reactionary view of civil government. Specifically, the tone of its view of the duties of "Kings" and "Princes" has been especially called into question.

The notes offer a doctrine of state which cannot be divorced from what has been called the exiles' "Deuteronomic view of history". The wickedness of the king brings God's wrath upon the "whole realme."[128] The exiles believed that God had given special duties and responsibilities to the civil magistrate, and that he was directly answerable to God for bringing peace and religious tranquility to the commonwealth. Rulers have need to call upon God that his Spirit may always be present with them.[129] It is impossible to govern well without "continual studie of Gods worde."[130] Where there is no magistrate fearing God, "there can be no true religion, nor ordre."[131] If the magistrate "suffreth fautes" to go unpunished "there the plague of God lyeth vpon the land."[132] The rulers are under divine responsibility to "giue eare to the true ministers of God" in order to prosper.[133] But if rulers are obstinate and become tyrants in oppressing the people, "it is a signe that God hathe drawen backe his countenance and fauour from that place."[134] In the reign of a good king like David there will always be "moste great plentie, bothe of frute & also of the increase of mankind."[135]

---

[128] Gen. 20:9, fol. 8, verso.

[129] Ex. 34:9, fol. 42, recto.

[130] Josh. 1:7, 8, fol. 97, recto.

Throughout the notes there is definitely an "anti-tyrant" motif. There are constant references to wicked craftiness, "open rage," and oppression of the "true religion" of God. God's judgment will be directed against such actions and against the magistrates who perform them. Thus there are instructions and principles laid down for magistrates to follow. In Israel's time the civil magistrate was required to consult the high priest before he made a decision, indicating that he "colde execute nothing but that which he knew to be the wil of God."[136] Kings ought to "loue their subiects, as nature bindeth one brother to loue another."[137] They are the "lietenants of God" who ought to grant unto him the "superioritie, and minister iustice to all."[138] Hezekiah is the notable example for all princes in that he established pure religion.[139] The story of Esther should help the magistrates to learn that they must procure the wealth of all their subjects, as well as being gentle and loving toward them.[140] The true use of the sword is the punishment of wickedness and vice and the maintenance of the good and virtuous.[141]

---

[131] Judg. 17:6, fol. 116, verso.

[132] 2 Sam. 21:14, fol. 146, recto.

[133] 2 Kings 12:2, fol. 170, verso.

[134] Job 34:30, fol. 232, recto.

[135] Ps. 72:16, fol. 250, recto.

A good governor "oght to be so deare vnto his people, that they wil rather lose their liues, then that oght shulde come vnto him."[142] The glory and wealth of a country "standeth in their preseruacion of the godly magistrate."[143] It is the duty of subjects to honor and reverence the office of the king and to obey his every precept as long as it does not conflict with God's law.

---

[136] Num. 27:21, fol. 75, recto.

[137] Deut. 17:20, fol. 88, verso.

[138] 2 Chron. 9:8, fol. 194, verso.

[139] 2 Chron. 29:3, fol. 202, verso.

[140] Esther 10:3, fol. 222, recto.

[141] Ps. 101:6, fol. 256, verso.

[142] 2 Sam. 18:3, fol. 144, recto.

[143] 2 Sam. 21:17, fol. 146, recto.

> Christ forbideth not to giue iuste honour to Magistrates and Masters, but condemneth ambicion and superioritie ouer our brothers faith, which office apperteineth to Christ alone.[144]
> The duetie which we owe to princes, letteth nothing that which is due vnto God.[145]
> Althogh the rulers be infideles, yet we are bounde to obey them in ciuil polices, and where as thei commande vs nothing against the worde of God.[146]

But, when it is said in Jeremiah 29:7 that the magistrate should be the object of prayer, the translators write,

> The prophet speaketh not this for the affection that he bare to the tyrant, but that they shulde pray for the communerest, and quietnes, that their troubles might not be increased, and that they might with more pacience and lesse grief waite for the time of their deliuerance.[147]

It would be unfair not to distinguish between the tone of the comments in the Old Testament and those in the New Testament. The latter are less negative and judgmental, whereas the notes in the Old Testament seem to be preoccupied with the wickedness and idolatry which characterized many civil administrations in the history of Israel. For example, the anti-tyrant polemic in Ezekiel compares tyrants to "cruel and huge beastes which deuoure all that be weaker then they, and suche as they may ouercome."[148] The judgment of God is often depicted as the cause of a ruler's downfall or death (the caption above Ezekiel 32 is "The end of tyrants"). There is a special preoccupation with the cause of the poor and oppressed people, and their cruel and unjust treatment by civil rulers.

---

[144] Mt. 23:8, fol. 13, recto.

[145] Lk. 20:25, fol. 39, verso.

[146] Tit. 3:1, fol. 101, recto.

[147] Fol. 318, verso.

But the consensus of the translators of the New Testament was that kings and princes had their rightful, God-given role to perform. And, certain heretical teaching notwithstanding, civil magistrates were even among those who had their names inscribed in the "Book of Life". The comment on Revelation 21:24 reads,

> Here we se as in infinit other places that Kings & Princes (contrarie to that wicked opinion of the Anabaptists) are partakers of the heauenlie glorie, if they rule in the feare of the Lord.[149]

Whether all the translators would have agreed with this conclusion is questionable. Perhaps Knox and Goodman had left too indelible an impression on the minds of some of them to overlook the travesty upon justice which had characterized too many of the civil magistrates they had known, or perhaps more likely, the nature of the biblical material caused the translators to follow its every precept, even if it meant risking contradiction.

---

[148] Ezek. 32:2, fol. 347, verso.

[149] Fol. 122, recto.

Worship, Church Order and Discipline

The doctrine of the church was actually treated in the section on the translators' "Deuteronomic view of history." However, there are a few themes relating to the church which were not covered in that section.

What the translators contributed to the doctrine of church worship is primarily negative. Most of their statements seem to be in defense of their Protestant worship, with a correlating condemnation of what the translators associated with Roman Catholic worship. Sacraments were given the People of God to signify their salvation, but a sacrament is invalidated when it is practiced without a sincere heart.[150] Circumcision was called the covenant between God and Israel "& hathe the promes of grace ioyned to it," a promise common to all sacraments.[151] The ark of the covenant was a sacrament to Israel, for it signified the presence of God to the nation. Thus "the signe is taken for the thing signified, which is commune to all sacraments both in the olde & newe testament."[152] Consequently, the paschal lamb was not the Passover, "as sacraments are not the thing it selfe, which thei do represent, but signifie it."[153]

---

[150] Gen. 4:3, fol. 2, verso.

[151] Gen. 17:10, fol. 7, recto.

[152] 1 Chron. 13:8, fol. 184, verso.

[153] Ex. 12:11, fol. 29, recto.

The signs or sacraments "oght not to be separate from the worde,"[154] for God forbids "all religion and seruing of God" which he has not commanded.[155]

Thus there appears to be a "sacramentarian" interest on the part of the translators. They went out of their way to show that a sacrament signified or represented a spiritual reality, and was not a part of the reality itself, in order to be able to preserve their sacramentarian belief concerning the Lord's Supper.

> The bread is a true signe, and an assured testimonie that the bodie of Iesus Christ is giuen for the nourriture of our soules: likewise the wine signifieth that his blood is our drinke to refreshe and quicken vs euerlastingly.[156]

Although there is no specific reference to transubstantiation, doubtless the translators felt they were undermining the possiblity of any "real presence" in the bread and wine by their emphasis on the representative aspect of sacraments. Perhaps there was sort of an anti-transubstantiation polemic behind the comments on Jesus' affirmation that he was the "bread of life", for the translators say "it cometh of the power of the Spirit that the flesh of Christ giueth vs life," meaning that the flesh of Christ is not that which gives eternal life, but the Spirit behind it.[157]

---

[154] Gen. 9:13, fol. 4, verso.

[155] Deut. 17:3, fol. 88, recto.

[156] Lk. 22:19, fol. 40, verso.

[157] Jn. 6:62, fol. 46, verso.

As might be expected, there is an iconoclastic motif in the annotations. Idolatry is one of the most frequently condemned sins, and there is a constant condemnation of the worship of images and the practice of "outward ceremonies". Images are not only not to be worshipped but also destroyed at the command of God.[158] The "molten stones" of Numbers 33:52 is translated "pictures", which "were set vp in their hie places to worship."[159] Superstition, idolatry and ceremonialism are contrary to the "true religion" of God's Word.

> There is no rage so cruel & beastely as of them whose heartes God hathe hardened, and who delite more in superstition & idolatrie, then in the true seruice of God & pure simplicitie of his worde.[160]

The polemic against idolatry, superstition and ceremonialism has its counterpart in the affirmation of what is frequently called "true religion" by the compilers. Idolaters think that God's religion is destroyed "when supersticiion & idolatrie are reformed."[161] Yet when these errors are abolished "there shalbe one God, one faith and one religion."[162] The "Argument" for Galatians shows how false apostles had corrupted the pure doctrine of the Gospel, teaching that "ceremonies of the law must be necessarily obserued, which thing the Apostle so earnestly reasoneth against." These rites and ceremonies at one time had their use, but now they are unprofitable and

---

[158] Ex. 23:24, fol. 34, verso.

[159] Fol. 78, verso.

[160] 2 Chron. 24:21, fol. 200, verso.

[161] 2 Kings 18:22, fol. 174, recto.

[162] Zech. 14:9, fol. 384, recto.

> pernicious, because Christ and trueth and the end thereof is come: wherefore men oght now to embrace that libertie, which Christ hathe purchassed by his blood, & not to haue their consciences snared in the grennes of mans traditions. . . .[163]

To the translators, Colossians showed that circumcision, abstinence from meats, external holiness and the worship of angels are not means whereby men come to Christ, for Christ abrogated such "offices" by his death.[164] Thus "all townes and countreis whence Gods worde, & good liuing is banished," where the "worde is not preached syncerly, nor maners a right reformed," comprise Satan's throne. Indeed, it is the throne of Satan which gives rise to the "deep things of Satan", condemned by Jesus in the book of Revelation. The translators accused "Anabaptists, Libertines, Papists, Arrians, & c." of using such things "to beautifie their monstruous errors and blasphemies."[165] The ceremonial law abrogated by Christ includes the use of mechanical instruments of music,[166] as well as the priesthood, thus making all other sacrifices for sin useless, since the sacrifice of Christ is the only expiation for sin.[167]

---

[163] Fol. 87, recto.

[164] "Argument", fol. 93, verso.

[165] Rev. 2:13, 24, fol. 115, recto-verso.

Church order in the annotations mainly concerns the office and work of ministers or pastors. "Bishops" (Philippians 1:1) were those who had charge of the "word & gouerning, as pastours, doctors, elders." "Deacons" were those who had charge of the "distribution, & of the poore and sicke."[168] The office of the deaconship lasted only for a short time, whereas the office of the eldership "conteineth the whole ministerie of the Church."[169] There seems to have been four distinct offices of the Church, corresponding to the offices of Calvin's Genevan church: pastors, doctors, elders and deacons, although the latter was probably eliminated. James is called the "chief" or "superintendent" of the Jerusalem church, but there is no recognition of any episcopacy in the early church.[170]

Only the responsibilities of the pastors, or, as they are more frequently called, "ministers", is given any detailed treatment in the annotations. They are the spokesmen for God, to whom the church should go in order to learn God's Word. They should maintain the peace and quietness of the church, yet they have the responsibility of making "the wicked more fautie and to proue his."[171] Ministers may speak "nothing as of themselues, but that onely, which they haue receiued of the Lord."[172] There is therefore a certain amount of judgment in proclaiming God's Word, and this is often the occasion of hostility and hatred which must be born by the ministers.[173] Yet it may be said that the minister "marieth Christ & his Church as housband and wife by the preaching of the Gospel."[174]

---

[166] Ps. 33:2, p. 241, recto.

[167] "Argument" to Hebrews, fol. 102, recto.

[168] Fol. 92, recto.

[169] 1 Tim. 4:14, fol. 98, verso.

[170] Note that "superintendent" was one of the temporary offices of the Church of Scotland, and a term preferred by John Knox. See Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland, edited by William Croft Dickenson (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1949), Vol. I, p. 334, Vol. II, p. 1906.

Ministers should be ordained only by the consent of the people,[175] yet as serious as it is to condemn God's ministers, "so it is greatly reprehensible to attribute more vnto them then is mete."[176] Christ "wolde not that his disciples and ministers shulde beare rule as worldelie gouernours do,"[177] yet the risk is sometimes inescapable, for it is necessary that the heads and officers of the church first be reformed "afore any good ordre can be established among the people."[178] They must set the example in search for perfection, not being content with "any meane reformation in religion," for such is at variance with God's Word and liable to certain judgment and condemnation.[179]

---

[171] Song. 2:7, fol. 281, recto and Jer. 7:27, fol. 309, verso.

[172] Ezek. 3:10, fol. 334, verso.

[173] Jer. 23:28, fol. 316, recto.

[174] 2 Cor. 11:2, fol. 86, recto.

[175] Acts 14:23, fol. 62, recto.

[176] 1 Cor. 4:1, fol. 77, verso.

There is not a little interest in the matter of church discipline in the annotations. Although the translators do not go as far as earmarking it as one of the marks of the true church, they do give evidence of a concern for keeping the church pure by the use of excommunication. The Jews had their councils of "ancient and expert men to reforme maners, and execute discipline,"[180] and the church was wise to incorporate this institution into its program. It goes by different names in the New Testament; John called it "casting out of the Synagogue," Paul, "deliuering to Satan". But whatever name is given to the institution, it is "moste terrible when it is iustely executed."[181] Evils should be corrected among those who are "conuersant in the Church," but those outside the flock cannot be corrected by ecclesiastical discipline.[182] Those who have a leading role in the affairs of the church should be given respect and honor, but "where this cause ceaseth," those who fail in their responsibilities "must be expelled as wolues out of the flocke."[183] Those who "liue idelly of other mens labours" should also be expelled.[184] But it must be remembered that the "end of excommunicacion is not to driue from the Church suche as haue fallen, but to winne them to the Church by amendement."[185]

---

[177] Mk. 10:43, fol. 22, verso.

[178] Ezek. 45:9, fol. 355, recto.

[179] Zech. 3:5, fol. 381, recto.

[180] Mt. 18:17, fol. 10, verso.

[181] Lk. 6:22, fol. 30, recto.

"Anti-Rome Polemic"

There is one final theme which consistently runs throughout the annotations. For lack of a better description the present writer will refer to it as an "anti-Rome polemic". This theme was not peculiar to the exiles, for they were acquainted with it from their training in humanist circles and the contributions to the Reformation of the _devotio_ _moderna_. Yet it became a familiar theme in English Protestantism, and since the Geneva Bible has been accused of fostering this kind of polemic, it will be necessary to point out the contributions of the translators to this rather negative theology of undermining the papacy.

---

[182] 1 Cor. 5:10, fol. 78, recto.

[183] 1 Thess. 5:13, fol. 96, recto.

[184] "Argument" to 2 Thess., fol. 96, verso.

[185] 2 Thess. 3:15, fol. 97, recto.

In the notes on the Old Testament the "Papists" are frequently condemned because of their worship of idols. The translators believed idolatry was the downfall of Israel, and the lesson for England was to destroy idolatry in any form in order to avert the same judgment and condemnation. The "Papists" are contrasted with Hezekiah, for they "slander the seruants of God: for where they destroie idolatrie, they say that they abolish religion."[186] They blaspheme the truth of God's Word when they "call images the bokes of the laitie."[187] The translators thought the "Papists" should have reflected on the material of which idols are made.

> . . . thogh thei se by dailie experience that their idols are no better then the rest of the matter whereof thei are made, yet thei refuse the one parte & make a god of the other, as the papists make their cake, god and the rest of their idoles.[188]

Not only are the Romanists accused of idolatry, but pilgrimages, celibacy and veneration of Mary are the objects of many bitter attacks. The "preacher" of

---

[186] 2 Chron. 32:12, fol. 204, verso.

[187] Is. 44:10, fol. 298, recto.

[188] Is. 44:15, fol. 298, verso.

Ecclesiastes urges his readers not to "vowe rashly" as those who "make a vowe to liue vnmaried, and suche like."[189] The comment on Jeremiah 44:17 reads,

> It semeth that the Papistes gathered of this place their Salue Regina, and Regina celi, letare, calling the virgine Marie Quene of heauen & so of the blessed virgine, & mother of our Sauiour Christ made an idole: for here the Prophet condemneth their idolatrie.[190]

There also seems to be another reference to Rome in Song of Solomon 5:7, where the "watchmen" are depicted as false teachers "which wounde their conscience" with their traditions.[191]

The notes on the New Testament are more pronounced with this theme. Although there is no anti-petrine polemic in Matthew 16:18 (where it might have been expected), Peter's arrogance and instability are often painstakingly pointed out in the Gospel accounts. The miracle in Acts 3, in which Peter has a leading role, provoked the translators to point out that the miracle was Christ's action, Peter being only the minister.[192] When Paul addressed his Colossian readers from Rome, he mentioned several of the brethren with him. But Peter's name is not mentioned. "If they onely did helpe him to preache the Gospel at

---

[189] Eccles. 5:5, fol. 278, verso.

[190] Fol. 326, recto.

[191] Fol. 281, verso.

[192] Acts 3:6, fol. 55, verso.

Rome, where was Peter? or those fiue & twentie yeres that thei faine he abode at Rome?"[193] Similarly, when Paul wrote 2 Timothy, there is no mention of Peter. The translators point out his absence with the observation that "if euer he was there it is vncerteine."[194] And, when Paul told Timothy that all his friends had forsaken him, it is stated, "If S. Peter had bene there he wolde not haue forsaken him."[195] Peter himself, in 2 Peter 2:3, describes false teachers who had perverted the Gospel. The translators offer the following as commentary:

> This is euidently sene in the Pope & his Priests, which by lies & flatteries sel mens soules, so that it is certeine that he is not the successour of Simon Peter, but of Simon Magus.[196]

Celibacy is again condemned as being a "rash vow".[197] The comment on Luke 20:34, where Jesus speaks of marriage, further illustrates the translators' view of such abstinence.

> In this place he calleth all them children of this worlde which remaine in the same: or els matrimonie shulde not seme to apperteine to the children of God, as that wicked monstre pope Cylicius taught against the manifest Scriptures.[198]

"Continual washings" have been brought into the church by the "Papists"--a superstition at variance with the practice of the early church.[199] As Moses will accuse those who venerate his name, so "the virgine Marie & the Saintes" will accuse those who call upon them, "& their owne conscience shal condemne the reprobat."[200] There was a great lamentation at the death of Stephen, but "note that here is no mention of any relikes or prayers for the dead, or worshipping."[201] Paul would not allow men to worship him "or his napkins," which should be a lesson ~~to~~ the "Papists" that they should neither worship nor revere any man, be he pope or saint.[202]

---

[193] Col. 4:11, fol. 94, verso.

[194] 2 Tim. 4:11, p. 100, verso.

[195] 2 Tim. 4:16, ibid.

[196] Fol. 111, recto.

[197] Mt. 19:12, fol. 11, recto.

[198] Fol. 39, verso.

The most slashing condemnations occur in the notes on the book of Revelation. The plague of locusts are said to be heretics and false teachers, "suttil Prelates, with Monkes, Freres, Cardinals, Patriarkes, Archebishops, Bishops, Doctors, Baschelers, & masters which forsake Christ to mainteine false doctrine."[203] The Roman clergy is characterized as "proude, ambicious, bolde, stoute, rash, rebellious, stubbern, cruel, lecherous, & autors of warre & destruction" against the simple People of God.[204] As would be expected, the Antichrist is the pope himself. The "two horns" on the small beast which came out of the sea are portrayed as Boniface VIII, who showed himself in two robes of apparel, one as pope, the next day as emperor:[205]

---

[199] Jn. 2:6, fol. 43, recto.

[200] Jn. 5:45, fol. 45, recto.

[201] Acts 8:2, fol. 58, recto.

[202] Acts 19:12, fol. 64, verso.

[203] 9:3, fol. 117, verso.

The number "666" in the book is applied to Rome,[206] with the observation that the doctrine of the papacy "is an horrible plague of God, which kepeth men stil in darke ignorance and errours."[207] The beast is portrayed as ancient Rome, and the harlot seated in scarlet upon it as the "newe Rome . . . whose crueltie and blood sheding is declared by skarlet."[208] Rome is constantly compared to a whore, deceiving the faithful by her immoral and sinful enticements. The "binding of Satan" of chapter 20, said to last for a thousand years, is the period of time from

---

[204] 9:7, *ibid*.

[205] 13:11, fol. 118, verso.

[206] The system used to derive such an application is called gematria--taking a name and finding successive numerical values for each letter. E.g. by taking the Greek letters in ΛΑΤΙΝΟΣ, and assessing a certain numerical value to each letter, one could conceivably derive the number 666. This particular application goes back to Irenaeus, but his application was not identical to that of the translators of the Geneva Bible: Irenaeus thought the number 666 referred to pagan Rome; the translators thought it referred to the Roman papacy.

[207] 16:10, fol. 119, verso.

[208] 17:3, fol. 120, recto.

Christ's nativity "vnto the time of Pope Syluester the seconde: so long the pure doctrine shulde after a sorte remaine."[209]

Thus the translators felt they were interpreting the book of Revelation in keeping with their own notions of what comprised "true religion". Their interpretations of all parts of the Bible followed this same pattern. There should be little wonder why many have called the Geneva Bible a "Protestant book". Nevertheless, the "anti-Rome polemic" of the translators was again in accordance with the English Protestant tradition.

---

[209] 20:2, fol. 121, recto.

A COMPARISON OF THE THEOLOGY OF THE GENEVA BIBLE WITH ENGLISH AND CONTINENTAL PROTESTANTISM

It is necessary to compare the theology of the Geneva Bible with the theology of both English and Continental Protestants in order to come to a fuller understanding of the theological contributions made by the translators of the Geneva Bible. It is particularly important to make this comparison with the theology of John Calvin, for the majority of historians who have dealt with the Geneva Bible have claimed that it fostered the theology of Calvin in sixteenth and seventeenth century England. One would certainly expect Calvin to have influenced the exiles during their stay in Geneva between 1555 and 1560.[1] But that the exiles owed their theological ideas to Calvin and Geneva cannot be proved. The focal point must be the theological background they brought to Geneva to be tried and tested under Calvin's influence.

This chapter will treat first of all the theology of the translators as reflected in their literary efforts prior to the translation of the Geneva Bible. The remainder of the chapter will trace the continuity and discontinuity of the theology of the Geneva Bible with both its English Protestant predecessors and Continental Protestants, with special attention to John Calvin.

---

[1] See Martin, Les Protestants Anglais, especially pp. 265ff.

The English Church at Geneva: Literary Efforts Prior to 1560

The English church at Geneva originated when a dispute between backers of the Edwardian Prayerbook and those who wanted to take the Reformation further erupted in the English congregation at Frankfort. Knox and his more progressive party were eventually outvoted and decided to seek another settlement where their plans for further reformation could be realized. This they were able to find at Geneva under their friend and advisor, John Calvin. They had corresponded with Calvin[2] during their difficulties at Frankfort, and now he obtained permission for them to set up their own views on worship, church order and discipline. As early as June 10, 1555, Calvin appeared before the Council of Geneva to indicate "that certain Englishmen are desirous to repair hither for the sake of the Word of God," and to request that the Council would be pleased to grant them a church in which they might preach and minister the sacraments.[3] The Council decreed that steps should be taken to provide a proper place for the English, and that conference should be had with Calvin on the subject. Several places were suggested, but nothing final was decided until the arrival of the exiles on October 13. On October 24, Calvin again appeared to remind the Council of its former resolution. Three syndics were appointed to examine the situation and recommend a suitable place. On November 14, the Council, having heard the report of the syndics, resolved to grant to the English, as well as to the Italians, the use of the church of "Marie la Nove".[4] They were to meet in this church, also known as the Auditoire, because Calvin lectured there, and on November 25, Calvin again appeared before the Council to work out the details. He recommended that the Italians should hold services on Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays, and that they should preach on Sundays at their accustomed hour, and that the services of the English should be on Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesdays, and that they should preach at nine o'clock, the minister being chosen by the English after he had been presented for examination and reception to the Council. The Council agreed, and on Friday, November 29, it is reported that Anthony Gilby and Christopher Goodman were received as ministers of the Word of God for the

---

[2] See Whittingham, Troubles at Frankfort, pp. 23ff.

[3] Mitchell, loc. cit.

---

[4] *Ibid.*

English inhabitants of Geneva. The ministers took the oath as required.[5]

John Knox no doubt was the most interesting personality among the exiles. He had come to Geneva to see the pure reformed faith in a realized situation, and to revive and refresh his wearied spirit by communion with like-minded Christian brethren, that "he and his associates might be nerved by what they witnessed for further achievements in the service of their common Lord and the good of their native land."[6]

It was to this city the exiles brought their own theological ideas to be tried and tested by the teachings of Calvin, teachings with which they found large agreements, and ultimately to have them inlaid alongside the ultimate source of their doctrines, the Bible.

Anthony Gilby

In 1547, Anthony Gilby answered the charges of Stephen Gardiner[7] relative to the doctrine of transubstantiation.[8] Gilby thought that Bucer, Oecolampadius and John Frith had correctly and adequately refuted the notion of transubstantiation, using arguments from scripture and the church fathers, "if these men would suffer their books to come to light."[9] But Gilby was compelled by Gardiner's arguments to answer them in his own way.

---

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

[7] The work which Gilby responded to was A Detection of the Devils Sophistrie, Wherewith he robbeth the unlearned people, of the true belief, in the most blessed Sacrament of the aulter, 1546.

[8] Anthony Gilby, An Answer to the devilish detection of Stephane Gardiner, Bishoppe of Winchester, 1547 (no colophon).

> The whole course of your book laboring to make Christ really and naturally present under these forms, qualities and quantities savoreth of the rotten pastures, and stinking fleshly brains of your dreaming doctors, Dunse, Thomas de Aquino, and petrus Lombardus.[10]

But Gilby also does not appreciate the "subtle sophists" of Cambridge, Oxford and the "Sorbornists of parise" for not abiding by the true and simple words of scripture. He is especially unhappy with terms which have been imposed upon the text of scripture like "reality", "quantity", "antecedents", "dimensions", and "alterations".

For Gilby, Christ's saying "I am the vine" should answer the whole problem of transubstantiation. Surely common sense would dictate that this saying is no different from the "Hoc est corpus meum" which Gardiner insists upon taking literally. Gardiner's argument that nothing is impossible for God and thus the bread can be changed into the body of Christ is most offensive to Gilby, for its use not only leaves the door open for other ludicrous arguments but also deceives the plowman with "devilish sophistry".[11]

---

[9] *Ibid.*, fol. ix, recto.

[10] *Ibid.*, fol. xvi, recto.

The mass is no sacrifice, Gilby contends, and there is no efficacy in the "mumbling, breathing and blowing" in a strange language which priests use to change the simple elements into Christ's body and blood.[12] Gilby fashions a bombardment of scriptural passages to show the "unprofitability" of the flesh, emphasizing knowing Christ in the heart, according to the Spirit, not in the flesh. Christ has ascended to be at the Father's right hand, and he cannot be put into a box "to wax mold and musty" and then to be changed "for a new Christ being infinitely created."[13] Luke 22 should make it apparent to Gardiner that Christ "did mean no change of natures, or transubstantiation" but only that where the blood of the lamb in the Old Testament was sprinkled on the posts to save from the avenging angel those who obeyed the commandment, the blood of Christ in the New Testament was shed to save us, or as many as have their souls sprinkled with the blood of the lamb, Jesus Christ. If it is so necessary to take the words of Jesus in Luke 22 literally, why is the cup not the blood of Jesus? Did not the Lord say of the cup as he handed it to the disciples, "This is my blood"?[14]

---

[11] Ibid., fol. xxi, recto.

[12] Ibid., fol. xxvi, recto.

[13] Ibid., fol. xxvii, verso.

Gilby prefers to call the Lord's Supper a "spiritual eating" which affords "life and foods for the soul."[15] It is therefore ridiculous to attribute the flesh of Christ to something which is not perceived by the outward senses. The phenomenon must be perceived inwardly by the Spirit; the body and blood of Christ assuredly refresh our souls, but not outwardly. The Christian eats spiritually the body and blood of Jesus.[16]

> Thus do we conclude, that the soul being a spirit and the meat spiritual: no man ought to seek for to eat Christ in this sacrament, bodily, really, and carnally, but only spiritually, as his word is spirit and life.[17]

The reception of the sacrament is the proclamation of the death of Christ.

> We do conclude therefore, that there is but one only eating of the body of Christ which is perceived of the faithful only: none otherwise, than these words (which is given for you, and which is shed for the remission of sins) are proper and peculiar unto them only.[18]

Accidents must have subjects, but where are the subjects after transubstantiation has taken place? If Gardiner intends to pursue his argument he will have to "wade in these dark terms of sophistry" in order to grant another substance which would sustain accidents besides the body and blood of Christ.

---

[14] Ibid., fol. xxviii, verso.

[15] Ibid., fol. xxx, recto.

[16] Ibid., fol. xxxii, recto.

[17] Ibid., fol. xxxiii, recto.

[18] Ibid., fol. xl, verso.

> And seeing that God hath created none other substance which hath these peculiar qualities that we feel, smell, see and taste still to remain, but only bread and wine: we must conclude against you: that here be two substances and creatures of bread and wine, unto whom God did in their creation, attribute and give these qualities, these accidents, these self same properties. . . .[19]

Gilby concludes his treatise on the Lord's Supper with arguments from church fathers, principally Augustine, which, in addition to arguments deduced from scripture, Gilby believed proved that Christ is in every place but only bodily in heaven.[20] Throughout these folios he continually points out that there is a distinction between a sign and that which it signifies--the two cannot be the same.

In 1551, Gilby published a commentary on Micah from London. The treatment of the text of Micah and the preface Gilby appended to the work correspond closely to the method used by the translators of the 1560 edition of the Geneva Bible. According to Gilby, Micah, a "diligent watchman," warned Israel in his prophecy of the impending judgment "that the Lord himself will come down most terribly to the wicked and the mountains shall melt, the valleys shall vade [fade] and vanish like wax before the firey flame."[21] The second chapter of Micah shows the damnation of those who have "vain thoughts and imaginations" of the world, and the third chapter shows the wickedness of false prophets and "chaplains" who will be threatened for their idolatry. In the sixth chapter, Micah contended with the people in the person of God "for their ingratitude, teaching the true worship of God to stand in judgment, mercy, and the reverence of the sacred majesty of the almighty." The final chapters show the prophet bewailing the scarcity of goodness and the "small trust of worldly friendship."[22]

---

[19] Ibid., fol. lxxiv, recto.

[20] Ibid., fol. ciii-cxv.

But the prophecy of Micah was not limited to the time of Israel's decline, for herein we have "doctrine for all ages."

> Let us therefore remember the old world before us plagued for sin, drowned for their wickedness, and fear the fire of Gods wrath, threatened by the prophets, to be kindled in these last times, to the everlasting destruction of all evil doers, who with the devil and his angels shall have a worm, the which shall hereafter gnaw and grate their conscience for ever, and a firey torment which shall never be quenched, whereof our prophet warneth the wicked work, threatening woe and damnation with

---

[21] Anthony Gilby, A Commentarye upon the Prophet Mycah (London, 1551), fol. Aii, verso.

[22] Ibid., fol. Aii-iii.

> fervent spirit and sorrow of heart, brasting forth into tears, yelling and sighing for the evils he did see towards them.[23]

All cities and countries were the objects of Micah's prophecy according to Gilby. Cruelty, extortion, tyranny, covetousness, avarice, ambition, the contempt of God's "true religion", idolatry, and all "like abominations" of men who reign as princes, rulers and "chief lords" are all alike condemned by Micah irrespective of the land where such is practiced.[24]

Clearly, Gilby had in mind for the people of England the applicability of Micah's stern warnings to Israel. His "Deuteronomic view of history" is nowhere clearer than in this lengthy statement.

> Now we that read and hear these old things of Samaria and Jerusalem, these things and princes. In the end of the world, must know that they are written for our learning, that we being warned by their scourge, plague, and fall: should fear to do the like wickedness. And here in this prophet chiefly we are warned of idolatry, ambition, and extortion. As for Idolatry (though our governors here in England through the mighty hand of God have for comfort of his elect banished the outward shew thereof) [.] Yet one sort making this most Godly and glorious fact to serve their lucre and gain to the slander of such a notable enterprise: have seemed to change the kind of idolatry, making it muck, which they found heaped about those idols, to be their God. . . . Another sort there is which in their hearts have idols still, and utter it when these idols of Walsingham, Canterbury, and their blessed mass were worshipped and regarded. There be more sorts which will be called Gospellers, that have some their God, some their subtle wits

---

[23] Ibid., fol. Aiii, verso-Aiv, recto.

[24] Ibid., fol. Av, recto.

> and worldly policies, some one thing, some another so that in effect idolatry is not banished, but reigneth more clokedly amongst us, to the ignominy and shame of the truth of one God, which we would seem to set forth and maintain. . . . Whereunto it behooveth high and low, the earth and all earthly creatures to give ear, and to harken. For it is the word of the Lord, not of man which Micah bringeth. The Lord himself doth speak it from the holy temple of his majesty, from whence he shall come down right shortly to be, both a witness and judge against us.
>
> Wherefore let us judge ourselves, now warned by God his word, that we be not judged of the Lord, and so for our wickedness with the world condemned. For our God (whose word is now sent among us) is a consuming fire, before whom no sin can be cloked. His word is the hammer breaking the hard stone.[25]

Two years after the commentary on Micah came out, Gilby published a commentary on Malachi. In this commentary, Gilby developed his doctrine of predestination, for he confesses in his Treatise on Election, dated 1556:

> Whereas three years ago, dearly beloved, I did write of this matter of Election and Reprobation, which is called Predestination, in a certain Commentary upon the Prophet Malachi, by the occasion of this text, 'I have loved Jacob, and I have hated Esau', the which Treatise, by the rage of persecution, partly perished, and part did come of late to my hands: accompting this doctrine so necessary, that upon all occasions it ought with reverence to be uttered to the glory of God. . . .[26]

Gilby subsequently published several other editions of his

---

[25] *Ibid.*, fol. Avi, verso-Avii, verso.

[26] Anthony Gilby, *A Briefe Treatise of Election and Reprobation, with certen answers to the Obiections of the aduersaries of thys doctrine* (London, 1575? Geneva, 1556), fol. Aii, recto. Cf. David Laing, *The Works of John Knox* (Edinburgh: James Thin, 1895), Vol. IV, p. 549. The commentary on Malachi is not extant.

Treatise on Election, including one added to a republication of A briefe Declaration of the chiefe Poyntes of Christian Religion, set foorth in a Table made by Theodore Beza, which had been translated by another of the English exiles, William Whittingham, in 1556. Gilby seemed perfectly happy with Beza's treatment of predestination, for he had set forth the "chief ground of this doctrine," and the principal points thereof "are so deeply opened," that there seemed to "want nothing that was possible in so few lines to be uttered. . . ."[27] Nevertheless, something obviously constrained Gilby to fashion his own treatise.

Gilby contends that without predestination there can be no faith but only despair. The doctrine of predestination depends upon the glory and honor of God, and an examination of the scriptures shows that the sovereignty of God insures the notion of predestination. God chose the elect before the beginning of the world to be "holy to himself," and has written their names in the book of life in the heavens, "that all their salvation resteth wholly upon his hands and holy counsel that can by no means be altered or changed."[28] Neither death, the devil nor hell "dare now accuse them that are by adoption grafted in Christ, who are called of the eternal purpose. . . ."[29]

---

[27] Ibid., fol. Aii, verso.

[28] Ibid., fol. Aiii, recto and verso.

Justification is put into the hearts of the elect by the Holy Spirit. The glad tidings of salvation and the assurance of redemption provoke faith on the part of the elect and condemnation on the part of the reprobate, in order that human pride might be beaten down and the glory and honor of God preserved.[30] The "double predestination" motif is clear in the following statement.

> So that resisting the power of God he perisheth in this world, and in the world to come he is appointed to the everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels by the just judgment of the Almighty Lord: who being refused and so openly resisted, justly doth give over the wicked to their own Reprobate minds. . . .
>
> This Reprobation then is the declaration of God his severe justice and just judgment, against the serpent and his seed, whom, by the word of his eternal wisdom he hath accursed from the beginning and appointed to everlasting torment.[31]

Yet this does not mean that God is the author of sin, for the scriptures clearly indicate otherwise, the testimony of the consciences of the wicked and the nature of sin prove sin is of their own doing, and the sovereignty of God demands that he be free to make of his vessels whatever he chooses.[32]

---

[29] Ibid.

[30] Ibid., fol. Aiii, verso-Aiv verso.

[31] Ibid., fol. Bii, verso-Biii, recto.

[32] Ibid., fol. Cii, recto.

> Therefore of necessity God did shut all under sin, that his mercy might flow over all. And that his mighty power might appear, he hath created the heavens and earth, wherein we do see light and darkness, death and life, shame and glory, weakness and strength, lies and truth, righteousness and unrighteousness, to serve to the setting forth of his glory. . . .[33]

Thus the good works which proceed from the Spirit of adoption and the feeling of God's mercies in election declare the power of God and the presence of the Spirit of Christ to be in us in order that we might be conformed to his eternal image. Good works then become a necessary consequence of predestination.[34]

> . . . by these good works wherein God will have us to walk, we are known to have his spirit to be good trees, and so judged by our fruits: as is the good apple tree by the apples, not that the apples make him good, but testify that he is good, and that it hath within itself a kindly power of good juice and nourishment. So we feeling the power of the spirit working in our hearts Godly motions, and so bringing forth good fruits of faith and good works, do confirm our Election and vocation. . . .[35]

A lengthy prayer within the body of Gilby's treatise depicts his whole doctrine of salvation.

> O father in the heavens, whatsoever we are, whatsoever we have, whatsoever we know, it is only by thy free grace, for we were by nature the children of wrath, and we are not born a new of flesh and blood, either of the seed of man, or the will of man, flesh and blood cannot reveal the mysteries of thy heavenly kingdom unto us. But by thy blessed will, are we that we are, and by the same know that

---

[33] Ibid., fol. Div, recto.

[34] Ibid., fol. Ei, recto.

[35] Ibid., fol. Ev, verso.

> we know: therefore (O Lord) do we commit into thy hands only our salvation. If our knowledge be small, yet we doubt nothing but that we are the children of thy everlasting kingdom, and therefore by thy mighty power, we shall grow when it shall be thy pleasure, to a more full and riper knowledge of a more perfect age, wherein our faith shall be fully able to comprehend and perceive the breadth, depth, height, and largeness of thy great mercies, and gracious promises. But seeing this power of full knowledge and perfect revelation, passeth all power natural, and remaineth only in thy power, and the light of thy spirit (O Lord). Do thou what shall please thee, to open to us thy servants and children, depending of thy hands, so much of the light of thy countenance, and at such times as shall seem good to thy wisdom and fatherly mercy. In the mean time thus resting wholly upon thee, neither can we despair, neither will we be too much careful, although we cannot attain to the knowledge of many of thy works, neither to the understanding of many places of the scriptures, but we will confess unto thee the weakness of our faith, waiting always for further revelation of thy glorious light to be uttered unto us, when thou shalt think of thy fatherly benevolence and goodness meet and convenient, knowing most surely that thou wilt pity our childish infancy, and cause the same to serve for thy glory and our great commodity, seeing that we do err and are childish, as sons before such a father which cannot put off his fatherly pity, but rather as thou has brought us unto thee, to be the heirs of thy kingdom by the blood of thy natural son, so we be most sure that thou wilt lighten us in the end, with the full fruition of the bright light of thy countenance, that we may see thee and know thee as this thy son our Redeemer knoweth thee, yea, see thee our father, face to face, and know as we be known. Thus rest we only of thy hand to increase our knowledge at thy good pleasure, O mighty Lord and most merciful father. So be it.[36]

The continuity of Gilby's position with that of the Geneva Bible is unmistakable. The glory and sovereignty of God remained the paramount starting-point from which all other doctrines ensued.

---

[36] *Ibid.*, fol. Bvii, verso-Ci, verso.

In 1554, Gilby had written a preface to Knox's *A Faythfull admonition* entitled *The Epistle of a Banyshed Manne out of Leycester Shire, sometyme one of the Preachers of Goddes Worde there*, in which the "Deuteronomic view of history" is seen in almost the identical light as was found in his commentary on Micah. In 1558, Gilby again wrote a preface to one of Knox's major works, *The Appellation from the Sentence Pronounced by the Bishops and Clergy*, entitled *An Admonition to England and Scotland, to call them to Repentence*. As might be expected, the heart of his treatise is the condemnation of England's apostasy and the pronouncement of God's judgment unless further reformation is immediately realized.

Gilby felt that Mary's ascension to the throne of England was part of the "just judgment" of God upon the commonwealth, for "doth not Esaias reckon this also as the extremity of all plagues for the wickedness of the people, to have 'Women raised up to rule over you'?"[37] Gilby compares England and her rulers to the wicked princes of Sodom and Gommorah, exhorting his native land to take away their wicked thoughts, cease to do evil, learn to do well, seek judgment and help the oppressed. For, if England fails to do God's bidding, he must come to her in stern judgment and condemnation. England must therefore repent.[38]

---

[37] Laing's text, IV, p. 554.

The Parable of the Two Sons is taken by Gilby to apply to first, Scotland, and second, England. Scotland is likened to the first son, England to the second son. The first son said to his Lord he would not go into the vineyard to work, but afterward he repented and went. But the second son promised to work in the vineyard, but he went not. The Gospel had a difficult time rooting itself in Scotland, yet the fruit which was born for the kingdom of God in Scotland was lasting and effectual. England took the Gospel firmly into its earth at first, but it has allowed bitter and harmful weeds to root out its harvest for the kingdom.

> And one crafty Gardiner, whose name was Stephen, having wolf-like conditions did maintain many a wolf, did sow wicked seed in the garden, and cherished many weeds to deface the vineyard. And his maid Mary, who after was his mastress, now married to Philip, wanting no will to wickedness when she was at the weakest, nor stomach to do evil when she got the mastery, did cherish many weeds. Those two, I say, have so broken the hedges of the same vineyard . . . that the husbandmen are hanged up, the diggers, dressers, and planters are banished, prisoned, and burned. Such havoc is made, that all wild beasts have power to pollute the sanctuary of the Lord.[39]

---

[38] *Ibid.*, pp. 554-556.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 562.

The chief labor in the vineyard is the reformation of religion. Scotland eventually repented and labored successfully in the vineyard. But England's labor was fruitless and harmful.

> In the time of King Henry the Eight, when by Tyndale, Frith, Bilney, and other his faithful servants, God called England to dress his vineyard, many promised full fair, whom I could name; but what fruit followed? Nothing but bitter grapes, yea briars and brambles, the wormwood of avarice, the gall of cruelty, the poison of filthy fornication following from head to foot, the contempt of God, and open defense of the Cake idol, by open proclamation to be read in the churches in the stead of Gods Scriptures. Thus was there no reformation, but a deformation, in the time of that tyrant and lecherous monster.[40]

Henry VIII is characterized as raging against God, the devil, Christ, the Antichrist, and even Luther, and raising forth "the name of the Pope, and yet allowing his laws, and his murder of many Christian soldiers, and of many Papists."[41]

Thus England was no better than the "Romish Antichrist", who banished the Word of God and set himself up as an idol to be worshipped. When there should have been further reformation, "nothing was hard but the Kings book, and the Kings proceedings; the Kings homilies in the churches, where Gods word should only have been preached."[42] Even the king himself was made a god! Gilby particularly bemoans the absence of discipline in the churches as well as the "correction of manners."[43]

---

[40] Ibid., p. 563.

[41] Ibid.

There is only one alternative for England.

> For this I admonish you, O ye people of England, wheresoever you be scattered or placed, that unless ye do right speedily repent of your former negligence, it is not the Spaniards only that ye have to fear as rods of Gods wrath, but all other nations, France, Turkey, and Denmark, yea, all creatures shall be armed against you for the contempt of those times when your heavenly Father so mercifully called you. To what contempt was Gods word, and the admonition of his Prophets, come in all estates before God did strike, some men are not now ignorant.[44]

The time of Mary has seen the rise of Jezebel and the prophets of Baal. The vineyard has been planted, England has responded with faithful and fruitful labor in the persons of the reformers, but now even the faithful laborers are being stoned and killed. All that remains is for the true son to come to England and be killed by wicked and cruel tyrants! England must repent of the abomination it has made of God's vineyard, or God's speedy judgment will come as a thief in the night. England's sins are clearly known. It must resist sin and its people must amend their lives, "obeying God in doing the works of righteousness," and executing God's precepts and judgments.[45] The Antichrist must be dealt with forthrightly, even opposed, in order to avert the hand of God's judgment.

---

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 564.

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 565.

[44] *Ibid.*

It was this kind of thinking which Gilby brought to his task of translating and annotating the Geneva Bible of 1560. The similarities are indeed striking, but to attribute his theological development as being dependent upon Calvin and Geneva is both anachronistic and false. Gilby brought his theology of the sacraments, predestination, salvation and the church in history with him to Geneva. That Calvin influenced his thinking on the matters of predestination and salvation is only possible at best, but it should be quite clear that his views on the sacraments and the church in history represent a different theological heritage.

Thomas Sampson

Sampson was perhaps the most accomplished Hebraist among the translators, but his pre-Geneva literary activity is limited to one letter written while exiled in Strasburg to his former parishioners in London.[46] Sampson bemoaned that his former London congregation had fallen into idolatry when it ought to have been an example to all England. Now London stands in the judgment of God.[47]

---

[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 566-567.

[46] Thomas Sampson, *A Letter to the trew professors of Christs Gospel/ inhabitinge in the Parish off Allhallowis/ In Bredstrete in London* (Strasburg, 1554).

Sampson plans to recite the "abominations" of the "papistical Pharisees", the most abominable of which is the doctrine of transubstantiation. This devious miracle is not to be believed, for

> Christ in instituting the Supper meant not to leave there his body and blood really and substantially as the papists do teach. . . . In the Supper he instituted a commemoration of the breaking of his body, and shedding of his blood, to be done and made of them that do eat that bread and drink of that cup, according to his institution: which he called his body and blood, for that it is to the receivers a seal and confirmation of Christs body broken, and Christs blood shed for them, that the profit and commodity thereof is theirs, which they do partake by faith.[48]

Sampson also points out, as did Gilby, that many sayings of Jesus are clearly figurative and metaphorical. Why should a special dispensation be made for the saying "this is my body?"

The author tells his former parishioners that there can be no sacrifice in the celebration of the mass, for the Supper should be a sacrament to us, in which Christians eat and drink of the elements which by faith become the body and blood of Christ. In partaking by faith, they declare the Lord's death.[49] Thus Christians should keep from making the sacrament an idol as the papists have done. Sampson also condemns the practice of withholding the cup from the laity.[50]

---

[47] *Ibid.*, fol. Aiii, recto.

[48] *Ibid.*, fol. Aiii, verso.

But the papists have also corrupted the doctrine of justification. They neither understand the force of the law nor its end. They make justification partly of God's grace, and partly of man's free will and good works. Sampson warns the London church that the papists will try to deceive them with such terms as "first grace", "second grace", "grace president", "grace concomitating", "grace following", "with the merit of congruence", and "merit of condignity". The result is a complete misunderstanding of true justification.[51] Sampson's own doctrine of salvation is seen in the following quotation:

> That by nature ye are the children of wrath of yourselves: as of your selves that ye are but such a lump of sin, that in you dwelleth no good thing. For which the law justly condemneth you as guilty of Gods curse and wrath, and so driveth you to Christ. By whose grace ye be freely justified.
>
> By whose bloodshedding, only and alone, the atonement is now made between God and you, which you believing are made the heirs of blessing of which your consciences by faith being assured by the work of Gods spirit, ye be at peace with God because ye do feel even in your hearts by lively persuasion of faith that Christ hath loved you, and given himself for you. For whose only sake

---

[49] Ibid., fol. Av, recto.

[50] Ibid., fol. Avii, recto.

[51] Ibid., fol. Avii, recto.

> ye are justified and saved: which you thus feeling are led by the same spirit that worketh this in you to render unto God the sacrifice of your body in living and doing those works which in his sight are acceptable, and that in a freedom and liberty of the spirit . . . subdueth the liberty of the flesh, and maketh it captive and bound to serve the spirit. In which you also walking when ye have done all that ye can do, if ye could do all that is commanded you to do, yet seeing all mans righteousness is but as a defiled cloth, ye seek not thereby the perimplishment [?] of your justification.[52]

Sampson clearly suggests that good works count nothing with God in the matter of justification, for after all we can do we are still forced to admit that we are unprofitable servants. But through faith in Christ human works are made pure, for the good we do is done by the Spirit of God working within us.[53]

Sampson exhibits in this letter the same view of man as was uncovered in the theology of the Geneva Bible. There is also a similar, almost identical, notion of the function of good works. The same Lord who justifies accepts good works from the faithful as just, perfect and good.[54] There is a constant emphasis on the "perfection of Gods regenerate child."

The letter thus covers a variety of topics, but the main theme seems to be of a polemical nature:

---

[52] Ibid., fol. Avi, recto-verso.

[53] Ibid., fol. Vii, recto.

[54] Ibid.

Rome has corrupted the "true religion" of the scriptures by its traditions and apostasies. Fasts, pilgrimages, vows, all of which Sampson takes as striving to earn justification, are condemned, as are invocation of the saints, offering prayers in a strange tongue, prayers for the dead and auricular confession. "Their error is, that Gods written word is not a sufficient doctrine unto salvation, but (they say) the voice of the church, traditions and councils are to be hard of necessity."[55]

It was doubtless Sampson's emphasis on the _sola scriptura_ which prompted him to write his former congregation about the Roman abuses of "true religion". But when he came to Geneva in 1555, Sampson had already developed many of his theological ideas, and not unlike Anthony Gilby, Calvin seemed to have had only a small influence on his thinking. But there was one particular area where Sampson confesses his dependence upon Calvin. Regarding the matter of preaching and edification and upbuilding of the saints, Calvin was master. "As much might I speak now that all things ye do in the congregation must be done to edifying. But of this to have full instruction I refer you to the mind of Master Calvin, lately translated and printed in English."[56]

---

[55] _Ibid_., fol. Bii, recto.

[56] _Ibid_., fol. Bv, verso. Sampson may have been referring to two of Calvin's works published in 1553: _Certain homilies conteining profitable admonition_ . . . , and _whether christian faith maye be kepte secret in the heart, without confession thereof openly_.

William Whittingham

Whittingham's literary contribution to English Protestantism prior to his leading role in the translation of the Geneva Bible consisted mainly of turning various Psalms into meter for liturgical use and certain prefaces which were appended to works by Nicolas Ridley, Christopher Goodman and John Knox. In 1556, he published at Geneva fifty-one Psalms turned into meter as part of the service book which Whittingham and his colleagues had been appointed to draw up at Frankfort. His other liturgical contributions were the revision of Sternhold's Psalms and a metrical rendering of the Ten Commandments which were appended to the Psalter of Sternhold and Hopkins. His eminence as a Hebraist allowed him to contribute more to the formation of the liturgy of the English church at Geneva than any of the exiles.[57]

In 1556, Whittingham wrote a brief preface to Ridley's treatise on the Lord's Supper, giving his approval of Ridley's arguments and conclusions. One would therefore except an examination of this work to divulge some reflection of Whittingham's own eucharistic theology. Particular attention should be given to Ridley's treatment of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

---

[57] A. F. Pollard, Dictionary of National Biography, edited by Leslie Stephen (London: Smith, Elder and Company, 1887), Vol. LXI, pp. 150-53.

Ridley's comprehensive examination of this doctrine begins by asserting that if it be Christ's own natural body which is present in the substance of bread, then it must be granted that transubstantiation has indeed taken place, i.e. that the substance of the bread has become the natural body of Christ. It would follow that the carnal and corporeal presence of Christ's body is present in the eucharist and that the sacrament should be adored with the honor due to Christ himself. Whoever partakes of the sacrament, therefore, be he murderer, adulterer or faithful, receives also the natural substance of Christ's own blessed body, both flesh and blood.[58] But if it can be shown from scripture that after the bread and wine had been blessed, the substances which remained were still bread and wine, then the argument for transubstantiation falls to the ground, the sophistry of such men as Scotus notwithstanding.

At this point Ridley goes to Paul's rehearsal of the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians. The apostle's statement,

---

[58] *Certen godly, learned, and/ comfortable conferences, betwene the/two Reuerende Fathers, and holye Martyrs of/ Christe, D. Nicolas Rydley late Bysshoppe/ of London, and M. Hughe Latymer/ Sometyme Bysshoppe of Wor-/cester, during the tyme of/ theyr empryson-/mentes./ Whereunto is added./ A Treatise agaynst the errour of Transubstan-/tiation, made by the sayd Reuerende Father D./ Nicolas Rydley,/ M.D.LVI* (no colophon). Cf. T. H. L. Parker, *English Reformers* (Philadelphia: The Westminister Press, 1965), pp. 298-99.

"The bread which we break, is it not the partaking or fellowship of the Lord's body?" clearly shows that after the thanksgiving it was bread which the apostle broke. The substance was still bread, therefore, and did not change into the body of Christ.

> The sacramental bread is the mystical body, and so is called in Scripture, 1 Cor. x., as it is called the natural body of Christ. But Christ's mystical body is the congregation of Christians. Now no man was ever so fond, as to say that that sacramental bread is transubstantiated and changed into the substance of the congregation. Wherefore no man should likewise think or say that the bread is transubstantiated, and changed into the natural substance of Christ's human nature.[59]

The same argument follows from what Christ said to his disciples concerning the cup: "I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine tree, until I shall drink that new in my Father's Kingdom." Christ called the cup the fruit of the vine, and the substance had not changed but remained "very natural wine".[60] Ridley affirms that it should be clear from the words of scripture that the substances had not changed but remained the same.

Ridley believes that his case is strengthened by the words of Paul when he recorded these words of Christ: "This cup is the new testament in my blood; this do as often as ye shall drink it in the remembrance of me."

---

[59] Ibid., p. 302.

[60] Ibid.

Does this not require the same magnitude of miracle as what the Romanists have done with the statement of Christ regarding the bread? Would they not be more consistent to affirm that the cup is transubstantiated into the New Testament rather than the blood of Christ? Ridley thinks so, and bears no mercy in showing the inconsistency of the papists whom he believes to be deceived by arguments from sophistry rather than depending upon the sure and simple Word of God.[61] Ridley then retreats to the interpretation of Augustine, which he takes to be figurative, and insists that the body and blood of Christ are obtainable to the Christian only figuratively and only by faith.[62]

Since Christ's body is "really" in heaven, it cannot be said to be here on earth. To affirm that his body is "really" present in the bread "maketh precious things common to profane and ungodly persons, and constraineth men to confess many absurdities." If transubstantiation is true, many whoremongers, murderers, even dogs and rats, eat the corporeal body of Christ! But John 6, where Jesus gives his sermon on the "bread of life", should adequately refute such a ludicrous doctrine if only the Romanists were true to scripture.[63]

---

[61] Ibid., p. 304.

[62] Ibid., p. 306.

[63] Ibid., p. 313.

Finally, Ridley gives his own affirmative confession.

> I say and confess with the evangelist Luke and with the apostle Paul, that the bread on the which thanks are given is the body of Christ in the remembrance of him and his death, to be set forth perpetually of the faithful until his coming.
>
> I say and confess the bread which we break to be the communion and partaking of Christ's body, with the ancient and the faithful fathers.
>
> I say and believe that there is not only a signification of Christ's body set forth by the sacrament, but also that therewith is given to the godly and faithful the grace of Christ's body, that is, the food of life and immortality. And this I hold with Cyprian.
>
> . . . .
>
> I confess that Christ's body is in the sacrament in this respect: namely, as he [Augustine] writeth, because there is in it the Spirit of Christ, that is, the power of the word of God, which not only feedeth the soul, but also cleanseth it. Out of these I suppose it may clearly appear unto all men how far we are from that opinion whereof some go about falsely to slander us in the world, saying we teach that the godly and faithful should receive nothing else at the Lord's table but a figure of the body of Christ.[64]
>
> . . .

Thus Nicolas Ridley wanted to leave the impression that he was not a thorough-going Zwinglian. It was the true blood of Christ in the chalice, but the point at issue is "how". It was the blood of Christ indeed, but not in the same form as that which sprang from the side of the Lord on Calvary. This blood which we drink is by sacrament. Likewise the bread, for it is indeed the body of Christ which we break, but only by sacrament. They nourish and sustain our spiritual bodies, just as baptism, ordained in water, regenerates our spiritual bodies.[65]

---

[64] Ibid., pp. 313-14.

In 1558, Whittingham wrote a preface to the controversial How Superior Powers Oght to be Obeyd by Christopher Goodman. There is little doubt that Whittingham concurred in the position of Goodman, notwithstanding a somewhat different stance taken in the notes on the New Testament in the 1560 edition of the Geneva Bible. Whittingham urged his brethren in England to "be persuaded in the truth of that doctrine concerning obedience to the magistrates, and so glorify God with us." If England wanted to know her true duty to the prince, "read this book and thou shalt well understand" it, and if she wished for Christian liberty, "come and see how it may easily be had." The focal issue was the primary obedience which must be rendered to God instead of men.[66]

> Obedience is necessary where God is glorified, but if God be dishonored thy obedience is abominable in the sight of God, be it never so beautiful in mans eyes. Gods word is our guide to lead us in our doings: when it commandeth us to obey God, we must disobey man in the contrary: for no man can serve two masters: and when our heavenly master commandeth obedience to man, it is ever to be understand, in the Lord. So that obedience to Gods Laws by disobeying mans wicked laws is much commendable, but to

---

[65] Ibid., p. 320.

[66] Fol. Aii, verso, from the preface. Cf. Christopher Goodman, How Superior Powers Oght to be Obeyd, 1558, published for The Facsimile Text Society (New York: Columbia University Press, 1931).

> disobey God for any duty to man is all together damnable. . . .[67]

It is this theme which Goodman develops throughout his treatise. No man can dispense with a law of God once it has been given, "seem it of never so little importance in the judgment of men."[68] Princes therefore, and all powers upon the earth, are not to be compared with God, for they are only his lieutenants.[69] Kings and rulers should be chosen by the people because of their faithfulness to God's word, for their office was ordained only for this role. Women should not rule, for where such is the case, the clear judgment of God stands against that nation.[70]

When tyrants try to rule against the will of God it is the duty of spiritual men to wage a spiritual war. The "stouter, stronger, and mightier" subjects are to take up the "spiritual sword" against the enemies of God.[71] The example Goodman proposes to be followed is that of the Maccabees, who actively and physically resisted Antiochus Epiphanes for the cause of God's righteous will.[72] Thus in such extreme cases, the faithful must take up the temporal sword "to the uttermost" of God's power in them.[73] This is not just the obligation of the apostles and preachers but every man who remains faithful to the divine purpose of God. Now that the wicked Queen Mary has come to the throne of England, the nation stands in peril of divine judgment unless the faithful take up arms and root out this "monstrous regiment of women".[74]

---

[67] Ibid., fol. Aiv, verso.

[68] Ibid., fol. Cvi, verso.

[69] Ibid., fol. Cviii, recto.

[70] Ibid., fol. Dii, verso.

[71] Ibid., fol. Ei, verso.

[72] Ibid., fol. Evi, verso.

Goodman contends that the New Testament does not militate against his view. Those passages where obedience to the king is enjoined upon Christians are to be interpreted in the light of a higher principle: Christians must first obey God, rather than men.

> But where as the kings or Rulers are become altogether blasphemers of God, and oppressors and murderers of their subjects, then ought they to be accompted no more for kings or lawful Magistrates, but as private men: and to be examined, accursed, condemned and punished by the law of God, whereunto they are and ought to be subject, and being convicted and punished by that Law, it is not mans, but Gods doing: who as he doth appoint such Magistrates over his people by his Law, so doth he condemn as well them as the people transgressing against the Law. For with God there is no respect of persons. . . .[75]

When wicked tyrants turn the nation into disorder and confusion and when power and liberty is taken from the common subjects it is their duty to rise up in rebellion. They should not be treated as brute beasts, but as noble and reasonable creatures. They have every right to their portion of the land which they inhabit.[76]

---

[73] Ibid., fol. Evii, recto.

[74] Ibid., fol. Gii, verso-Giii, recto.

[75] Ibid., fol. Iiv, recto-verso.

Goodman concludes his treatise with an appeal to the nation of England. Again, the "Deuteronomic view of history" is glaringly apparent; England will suffer certain doom unless she repents. And, each person within the commonwealth has his own responsibility to obey God in tearing down idolatry and rising up against wicked tyrants who insure the nation's destruction.

The Registres de Conseil of Geneva records that on November 13, 1559, William Whittingham, John Barron and John Knox were involved in a literary effort relative to a certain treatise on predestination. These men asked for permission to have it printed in Geneva, in English, because certain Englishmen elsewhere had written against it. Permission was granted, provided that the treatise would not bear the subscription "Imprinted at Geneva". Whittingham and Barron promised to be responsible for the piece, assuring the Council that there would be nothing in it contrary "to the catholic and orthodox doctrine."[77]

The author of the treatise was John Knox, and Whittingham revised it for printing at Geneva in 1560.

---

[76] Ibid., fol. Kii, verso-Kiii, recto.

[77] Registres de Conseil, Archives, Hotel de Ville, Geneva, fol. 144, November 13, 1559, quoted in Laing, Works of Knox, Vol. V, p. 16.

Although he did not attach any literary effort of his own, an examination of Knox's position should certainly show at least some of the translator's thinking. In addition, since this motif is one of the salient emphases in the Geneva Bible, it will be important to notice how much Knox's doctrine of predestination influenced the compilers.

Knox begins by using a similar argument that Gilby had used in his treatise on predestination. There is no way more proper to build and establish faith than "when we hear and undoubtedly do believe that our Election (which the Spirit of God doth seal in our hearts) consisteth not in ourselves, but in the eternal and immutable good pleasure of God."[78] Then Knox proceeds to affirm his continuity with Calvin's position which the reformer had taken in his 1550 edition of the _Institutes_.[79]

To Knox predestination may be defined thus:

> PREDESTINATION, whereof now this question is, we call the eternal and immutable decree of God, by the which he hath once determined with himself what He will have to be done with every man. For he hath not created all . . . to be of one condition. Or, if we will have the definition of Predestination more large, we say, that it is the most wise and most just purpose of God, by the which, before all time, he constantly hath decreed to call those whom

---

[78] John Knox, _An Answer to a Great Nomber of blasphemous cauillations written by an Anabaptist, and aduersarie to Gods eternal Predestination_, 1560. Cf. Laing's text, _ibid_., p. 26.

[79] _Ibid_., p. 31.

> he hath loved in Christ Jesus, to the knowledge of himself and of his Son Christ Jesus, that they may be assured of their adoption by the justification of faith; which working in them by charity, maketh their works to shine before men to the glory of their Father, so that they . . . may finally receive that glory which is prepared for the vessels of mercy.[80]

But Knox proceeds to develop the doctrine of predestination to the extent that it includes the notion of reprobation. In a passage very similar to Gilby, Knox suggests that the end why the reprobate were created "neither was, nor is not, their only perdition . . . but that the glory of God must needs appear, and shine in all his works."[81] The perdition of the reprobate depends upon God's eternal predestination, yet the just cause of their perdition is found within themselves. Although this is not comprehensible to man, it is most just and holy because it preserves the holiness and sovereignty of God.[82]

The propositions Knox is willing to affirm against the denial of the English Anabaptist reflect both the positions of Gilby in his Treatise on Election and Calvin's 1550 edition of the Institutes. God, in his eternal and immutable counsel, has once appointed and decreed whom he would take to salvation, and whom also he would leave in ruin and perdition. Those whom he elected to salvation, he receives in free mercy, without any respect to their own merits or dignity, but of undeserved love he gave them his only Son to be their inheritance. He calls the elect in his own time, and they respond in obedience to his voice, "and so do they attain to the joy of that kingdom which was prepared for them before the foundations of the world were laid."[83] But those whom he has decreed to leave in perdition he keeps from entering into eternal life, "that either they are left continually corrupted in their blindness, or else if grace be offered, by them it is oppugned and obstinately refused."[84] Although it may seem that they have received the grace of God, it will last only a short time, "and so they return to their blindness, and crooked nature, and infidelity again, in which finally they justly perish."[85] These propositions are confirmed, in the thinking of Knox, by a careful examination of scriptural passages.

---

[80] Ibid., p. 36. This definition closely resembles Calvin's definition in his 1550 Institutes.

[81] Ibid., p. 41.

[82] Ibid.

Knox is careful to point out that the reprobate are not denied eternal life by their sins only; the chief reason eternal life is denied them is because they were not chosen among the elect, that the glory of God remain preserved.[86] And, correspondingly, the good works of the elect are not the cause of their election, but the natural result. They were chosen to be the elect by God before the foundations of the world, and it is this which insures their eternal life, not anything they do.[87] Freedom of the will, therefore, does not play a part in either election or reprobation.[88]

---

[83] Ibid., p. 42.

[84] Ibid.

[85] Ibid.

[86] Ibid., p. 71.

> Thus use we to reason by the diversity which we see in men, that one sort are Elect and others are Reprobate, and not as ye imagine us to do. We say, that Nature hath made us equal as concerning corruption, and yet we see great diversity amongst men. We ask what is the cause of this? If ye answer, Education, which some philosophers do; that will be proven false, as before I have declared. If ye say, Man's free will; we proceed, demanding who giveth the good will? If ye allege, Man himself; the Scriptures proveth you liers, saying, 'It is God that worketh the will and the performance.' If God be granted . . . to be the only author of all goodness, then ask we, Why giveth he the good will to the one, and not to the other? If ye answer, Because the one receiveth grace and the other doth refuse it, ye have said nothing to the purpose. For we still demand, If God may not . . . frame and form the will of the one to as great obedience as the will of the other, fret and fume as ye list: this ye can not deny, except that ye will be blasphemous deniers of his omnipotent power.[89]

The rest of Knox's treatise is a refutation of arguments made against his affirmative propositions, with a bombardment of scriptural citations and quotations from Calvin and Beza.

---

[87] *Ibid.*, p. 76.

[88] *Ibid.*, p. 109.

[89] *Ibid.*, p. 125.

The Genevan Confession

This section would be incomplete without some treatment of the confession of faith made by the exiles in Geneva. It would be exceedingly difficult to fully understand the theology the compilers of the Geneva Bible brought to their task without a comparison of the confession of faith they made originally in February of 1556.

In Knox's account of the troubles at Frankfort he tells how he, Whittingham, Gilby, Foxe and Cole were appointed to draw up "some Order meet for their state and time" which would be used as the basis for the worship of the church of the exiles at Frankfort. The order was well liked by many, but "such as were bent to the Book of England could not abide it."[90] But the troubles at Frankfort necessitated the departure of those who had been outvoted, and thus the project of drawing up the confession went for naught. It was no doubt this preparation which was the foundation for the _Forme of Prayers and Ministrations of the Sacraments_ which comprised the manifesto of the exiles in Geneva. The influence of Calvin's forms of prayer and discipline should not even be questioned, although the extent to which he heartily endorsed all of the confession may be a matter of some dispute.

---

[90] Cf. Laing, _Works of Knox_, IV, p. 146.

The forme of prayers and ministration of the Sacraments, &c. used in the Englishe Congregation at Geneva: and appoued, by the famous and godly learned man, John Caluyn,[91] is prefaced by an appeal to England, entitled "To our Bretherne in Englande, and els where, which love Jesus Christe unfaynedly, Mercie and Peace," usually attributed to Whittingham. Just a scant reading of this preface will convince the reader that it is in the identical family with the prefaces of the Geneva New Testament of 1557, and the complete Bible of 1560. The same motifs and preoccupations of the preface to this confession are found in the preface to the Geneva Bible of 1560, even to the degree of identical wording. The same "Deuteronomic view of history" which is so apparent in the prefaces to the Geneva Bible pervades every paragraph of the preface to the confession.

After the author of the preface extols the great mercies God has shown England, and how the nation has fallen into judgment because of its unfaithfulness and idolatry, he exhorts England to repent, "For now the day of our visitation is come, and the Lord hath brought the plagues upon us, whereof before we were admonished, and most justly menaced." It is for this cause that such a confession of faith is drawn up. It is "a form and order of a reformed church, limited within the compass of

---

[91] Cf. Laing, IV, pp. 149ff., for the text.

God's Word, which our Saviour hath left unto us as only sufficient to govern all our actions by." All the blasphemous contentions of those who would pervert the Word of God are to be abhored and overcome.

> The which considerations, dear Brethren, when we weighed with reverent fear and humbleness; and also knowing, that negligence in reforming that Religion which was begone in England, was not the least cause of God's rods light upon us, having now obtained by the merciful providence of our heavenly Father a free Church for all our nation in this most worthy city of Geneva, we presented to the judgment of the famous man John Calvin, and others learned in these parties, the Order which we minded to use in our Church: who approving it, as sufficient for a Christian congregation, we put the same in execution, nothing doubting but all godly men shall be much edified thereby.

The preface concludes with an acknowledgment that both England and the exiles share the same "cross of affliction", but God is faithful to his covenant and promise if his people are faithful to their promise of obedience. The author calls for a restoration of God's Word, comfort and strength to the children of God and the confounding of Satan, Antichrist and all his enemies.

The confession of faith is straightforward and reflects the Reformed tradition in almost every respect. There is little Calvin would not agree with, perhaps with the exception of the article on the church. The exiles confessed,

> I BELIEVE therefore and confess one holy Church which (as members of Jesus Christ, the only head thereof) consent in faith, hope, and charity, using the gifts of God, whether they be temporal or spiritual, to the profit and furtherance of the same.

> Which Church is not seen to man's eye, but only known to God, who of the lost sons of Adam, hath ordained some, as vessels of his mercy, to be saved; the which also, in due time, he calleth to integrity of life and godly conversation, to make them a glorious church to himself.
>
> But that Church which is visible, and seen to the eye, hath three tokens, or marks, whereby it may be discerned. First, the Word of God contained in the Old and New Testament, which as it is above the authority of the same church, and only sufficient to instruct us in all things concerning salvation, so is it left for all degrees of men to read and understand. For without this Word, neither church, council, or decree can establish any point touching salvation.
>
> The second is the holy Sacraments, to wit, of Baptism and the Lords Supper: which Sacraments Christ hath left unto us as holy signs and seals of God's promises. For as by Baptism once received is signified that we . . . being strangers from God by original sin, are received into his family and congregation, with full assurance, that although this root of sin lie hid in us, yet to the elect it shall not be imputed. So the Supper declareth, that God, as a most provident Father, doth not only feed our bodies, but also spiritually nourisheth our souls with the graces and benefits of Jesus Christ (which the Scripture calleth eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood); neither must we, in the administration of these sacraments, follow man's phantasy, but as Christ himself hath ordained so must they be ministered, and by such as by ordinary vocation are thereunto called. Therefore, whosoever reserveth and worshippeth these sacraments, or contrariwise condemneth them in time and place, procureth to himself damnation.
>
> The third mark of this Church is Ecclesiastical discipline, which standeth in admonition and correction of faults. The final end whereof is excommunication, by the consent of the Church determined, if the offender be obstinate. And besides this Ecclesiastical censure, I acknowledge to belong to this church a political Magistrate, who ministereth to every man justice, defending the good and punishing the evil; to whom we must render honor and obedience in all things, which are not contrary to the Word of God.[92]

---

[92] Cf. the text in Laing, IV, pp. 171-73.

The extent to which Calvin would agree with this article will be discussed below. Nevertheless, the fact that it was drawn up with the alleged approval of the reformer causes some problems that can not be dismissed easily.

Summary and Evaluation

The literary efforts of the exiles prior to 1560 should show convincingly that the theology which was adumbrated in the annotations of the Geneva Bible is not wholly due to the influence of Calvin and Geneva. The only possible influences exerted by Geneva upon the exiles would be the doctrine of predestination and the setting up of church order. Gilby had developed his doctrine of predestination at least as early as 1553, yet his position reflects considerable agreement both with the Institutes of 1550 and 1559. But agreement is not the same as borrowing, and it cannot be proved conclusively that while he was in Geneva Gilby borrowed from Calvin his views on predestination. One thing is clear: Gilby brought his views with him to Geneva in 1555. If Calvin had influenced his thinking, it must have been before he ever left England.[93]

The theology of the Geneva Bible resembles the thought of Gilby more than any of the other exiles. The emphasis on the spiritual feeding in the eucharist and the distinction between a sign and what it signifies, is clearly found in the notes of the Geneva Bible. Gilby lacks the emphasis on partaking of the sacraments by faith which is characteristic of both Sampson and Ridley. Sampson's insistence on the denial of any real or substantial presence of Christ in the eucharist is also a familiar motif in the Geneva Bible, as is the nature of the sacraments, which seal and confirm the efficacy of Christ's body for the believing partaker. Ridley's argumentation is foreign to the notes of the Geneva Bible, and his insistence on not being a Zwinglian would not be a suitable comparison with the position of its compilers, notwithstanding Whittingham's alleged endorsement in his preface to Ridley's work. Ridley seems to be more in line with the position of Peter Martyr than the "sacramentarian" views of Gilby and Sampson.

---

[93] Evidence that Calvin's doctrine of predestination influenced English Protestants during Edward's reign may be found in a letter from Bartholomew Traheron to Henry Bullinger dated September 10, 1552. See Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation . . . from the Archives of Zurich, edited for the Parker Society by Hastings Robinson (Cambridge: The University Press, 1846), pp. 324ff. For a contempoary discussion of the influence of Calvin's doctrine of predestination in Elizabethan England, see John F. H. New, "The Whitgift-Cartwright Controversy," Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte (Jahrgang 59, Heft 2, 1968), pp. 203-211.

The emphasis on good works as a natural consequence of predestination is common to Gilby, Sampson and Knox. Here they reflect the doctrines of Barnes and Tyndale which is common to the whole English Protestant tradition (with a possible exception in John Frith).[94] The striving for perfection in the child of God is also a common motif in the works of the translators, as well as the notes of the Geneva Bible.

Goodman's treatise on the state certainly reflects the position of the Geneva Bible, although Goodman is considerably more blunt and outspoken. For example, the compilers are less inclined to advocate open, physical resistence to civil authorities, although they certainly leave open the possibility. The preface of Whittingham to Goodman's work is somewhat perplexing, for one would expect Whittingham's thinking to be behind most of the annotations of the New Testament, since the majority of the notes in his 1557 edition are found also in the 1560 edition.[95] It is certainly possible, perhaps even probable, that during the time between his preface to Goodman's treatise and the translation of the 1560 edition of the

---

[94] See William A. Clebsch, England's Earliest Protestants (New Yaven: Yale University Press, 1964).

[95] See page 99 above, where it was pointed out that the notes on the New Testament are less offensive and judgmental than the notes on the Old Testament.

New Testament Whittingham mellowed somewhat under the influence of Calvin. Calvin was embarrassed by both Knox and Goodman in their treatments of obedience to civil powers. But this explanation is devoid of proof and does not clear away the ambiguities of Whittingham's position. It can be said, however, that the position represented in Goodman's treatise is reflected more in the notes of the 1560 edition of the Geneva Bible than in Whittingham's New Testament of 1557.

The views of the exiles on the church and history are remarkably similar, even identical. Gilby suggested that the prophecy of Micah contains warnings for all ages, but he specifically mentions England, which, because of the devious conniving of Henry VIII, and the "monstrous regiment of women", stands in danger of God's punishment for not taking the Reformation far enough. Both Goodman's treatise and Whittingham's preface to the Genevan confession of faith echo the same sentiments. And, as was pointed out above, this "Deuteronomic view of history" is one of the salient contributions of the Geneva Bible to English Protestantism.

Only on the matter of predestination is there a possibility of Calvinist theological influence, and this lacks sufficient evidence. Knox makes numerous quotations from Calvin's 1550 Institutes, but Gilby does not. Yet Knox and Gilby clearly reflect the same tradition, utilize similar methods of approach and show a common interest in both form and content. The present writer would rather say that Knox, and especially Gilby, arrived at their doctrines of predestination independently, or, at most, indirectly of Calvin. Although Knox quotes both Calvin and Beza in his treatment of predestination, his intention may have been to corroborate his own views rather than the actual borrowing of ideas.

There is one clear debt the exiles owed to Calvin. The matter of church order in Geneva, which owed its origin to Calvin, was indeed an impressive sight to the exiles from England. Never had they seen "true religion" so much in evidence. For in Geneva, the Bible occupied a central role, and the worship and order of the church was patterned after their ideas of the practice of the apostolic church. Discipline was paramount, and this met with the fancy and convictions of the English. Sampson was not afraid to tell his London congregation that they should turn to Calvin to learn the more excellent ways of edification in the church.

But the article on the church in the Geneva confession of faith presents several problems. Although ecclesiastical discipline is treated in the annotations of the Geneva Bible, it is nowhere exalted as one of the marks of the visible church. Anthony Gilby strongly urged the practice of discipline in his treatises, but he does not identify it as one of the necessary marks. Calvin himself emphasized the need for ecclesiastical discipline, but he was convinced that the only two marks of the true church were the preaching of the Word and the correct administration of the Sacraments. Yet Calvin allowed his name to be subscribed to the Genevan confession. Perhaps his motives were more political than theological, or the wording in the confession so arranged as to save him any embarrassment or inconsistency. Nevertheless, it must be assumed that the addition of the third mark of the visible church owes its origin to sources other than Calvin. The compilers may have concurred with this notion, but it cannot be said they originated it, or that it was a major preoccupation at the time of their translation of the Geneva Bible.[96]

The stress on the reading and understanding of the Bible is peculiar to English Protestantism, probably as a direct result of Erasmian humanism. Calvin would have stressed more the preaching and hearing of the Word.[97] Here again, the Geneva Bible is in line with its English Protestant tradition, for the compilers continually stress the necessity of reading and understanding the scriptures.

---

[96] The source in Geneva was probably Knox and Goodman. Two sources from which they likely borrowed were Erasmus Sarcerius, Common places of scripture orderly . . . set forth . . . to the great profyte and helpe of all suche studentes in gods worde. . . , translated into English by Richard Taverner (London, 1538), fol. CL, recto-Clv, verso; and, Peter Martyr Vermigli. An excellent treatment of Martyr's life and theology, from the point of view of his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, is Joseph C. McLelland, The Visible Words of God (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957). Cf. pp. 125ff, for Martyr's identification of the "third mark" of the visible church.

It is also doubtful whether Calvin would have included the notion of the church's responsibility of providing a civil magistrate to administer in the role as leader of the state the precepts of the Word of God. The compilers of the Geneva Bible were in complete agreement with the confession of faith of the English body politic in Geneva on this point, for it was a necessary concomitant to their view of the church and history.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the admonition to render obedience to the king as long as it is "not contrary to the Word of God" is very similar to the emphasis in the Geneva Bible. Doubtless Goodman's work was on the minds of the originators of the confession, but, perhaps due to Calvin's displeasure and discomfort of such exorbitant means, they softened their statement with less offensive words.

---

[97] Cf. the Confession of the Church at Geneva in 1536, in Reformed Confessions of the 16th Century, edited, with historical introductions by Arthur C. Cochrane (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946), p. 125f.

Continuity and Discontinuity of the Theology of the Geneva Bible with English and Continental Protestantism

Now that the theological tradition of the exiles has been set in clear focus it is necessary to show its continuity and discontinuity with English and Continental Protestantism. As has already been pointed out, many historians who have dealt with the Geneva Bible accuse its translators of fostering Calvinism and planting the seeds of Puritanism. Thus the theology and theological development of John Calvin is a necessary focal point from which to view the theology of the Geneva Bible. While it will be necessary to refer to the Wittenberg brand of Protestantism periodically, it should be pointed out that the English exiles owed more indebtedness to the Protestants of the Rhineland than to Wittenberg. Therefore Luther's thought will be treated only as in indirect source except where it is more apparent that his theology played a more prominent role. It also will be necessary to show the indebtedness the exiles owed to their own English Protestant heritage.

The nature of this section will be limited necessarily to the overall scope of the present project, i.e. the theology of the Geneva Bible of 1560. Many questions doubtless will be raised which obviously cannot be treated fully. The issue of most concern is the theology of the Geneva compilers, and to understand their contributions, it is now necessary to place their thought in its historical and theological context.

Predestination

Calvin's early interest in the subject of predestination was not as pronounced as in later editions of the Institutes. It certainly was not the focus around which he developed his whole theological pattern.[98] It is questionable that Calvin taught such a pronounced doctrine of reprobation in the earlier editions of the Institutes as is found in the Geneva Bible. But beginning with the edition of 1559, Calvin began to draw more attention to the implications of the doctrine of predestination in its relation to providence.

> We call predestination God's eternal decree, by which he determined with himself, what he willed to become of each man. For all are not created in equal condition; rather, eternal life is foreordained for some, eternal damnation for others.[99]

Grace is by no means offered by God only to be rejected or accepted depending upon the honesty or goodness of man, but "it is this very grace which forms both choice and will in the heart, so that whatever good works then follow are the fruit and effect of grace. . . ."[100] Therefore all good works which naturally follow from the choice of God's election are fruits of predestination. The elect cannot resist God's choice, for he is an instrument of the divine will. His own will is not destroyed but liberated, "by making him will what God expects of him."[101]

---

[98] François Wendel, Calvin, the Origins and Development of his Religious Thought, translated by Philip Mairet (London: Wm. Collins, Sons & Co., Ltd., 1963), p. 264.

[99] John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, edited by John T. McNeill and translated by Ford Lewis Battles (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), Two Volumes, III, 21, 5.

Whereas the exiles constantly place the doctrine of predestination subservient to the sovereignty and holiness of God, Calvin places it upon a soteriological foundation. That election is founded on Christ assures the elect of their redemption. Both the exiles and Calvin indicate that election manifests itself in clear and positive signs of concrete reality, but the exiles seem to emphasize more the necessity of good works as a consequence of predestination. Calvin does not say that our election is proved by good works.[102]

Influenced by Augustine and Bucer, Calvin taught that election has been decided once for all, and it cannot be changed any more than the divine will can be changed. And yet the performance of election is not altogether certain except insofar as the predestination of individuals is concerned. Calvin developed this idea by structuring several different kinds of election, such as election of the people of Israel, of Abraham and of those "individual persons, to whom God not only offers salvation, but so assigns it that the certainty of its effect is not in suspense or doubt."[103] The exiles made no such distinctions.

---

[100] Ibid., II, 3, 13.

[101] Cf. Wendel, p. 274.

[102] Institutes, III, 21, 7. Cf. Wendel, p. 277.

In summary, Calvin's doctrine of predestination is very similar to that of the exiles. But there are some important differences. Gilby seems to be closer than Knox to Calvin's position in the 1559 *Institutes* and Knox's view reflects more Calvin's position in the 1550 *Institutes* (from which he borrows many quotations). Thus where Calvin departed from Augustine in setting forth the idea that the reprobate should be the objects of a special decree, he is followed by Gilby (notice the anachronism) but not so much by Knox, who remains more in the tradition of Augustine.[104] There is enough discontinuity between Calvin's doctrine of predestination and that of the exiles to render unconvincing the assertion that the exiles borrowed their doctrine from Calvin while they were in Geneva. As was pointed out above, Gilby and Knox may have already developed their doctrines of predestination before they came to Geneva, and that Calvin's Genevan influence was only indirect and corroborative. This is the more likely explanation in view of Gilby's thinking prior to coming to Geneva and Calvin's reticence to adumbrate a pronounced view of reprobation in the earlier editions of the Institutes.

---

[103] *Ibid*., III, 21, 5-7.

[104] Cf. Wendel, p. 280.

Salvation

To Martin Luther the salvation of man was wholly the work of God. As man stood coram deo there was nothing man could do to save himself. Salvation was a reality only by the grace of God whereby he imparted faith into the hearts of the elect. Even after man's justification by faith the taint of original sin continued to marr the character of the man of God. He is inwardly always a sinner but outwardly just, and there is nothing he can do which is good--only God's grace imputes goodness to human works. Man should continually try to cleanse the sin from his flesh, but mortification should not be demanded as an achievement but as a process.[105] Justification comes at the beginning of the Christian's life, and the rest of his life is spent in rooting out sin, bearing good fruit and bringing Christ to bear in his life through service to his neighbor. But these human works take place within the realm of faith, after the will has been affected by justification, in which the righteousness of Christ becomes our's by faith. Paradoxically, man is both sinner and righteous. What he does is sinful, but what he does by faith is made righteous by God's gracious gift.[106]

---

[105] Luther's Works, Volume 9: Lectures on Deuteronomy, edited by Jaroslav Pelikan (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1960), p. 186.

For Luther, faith was an existential experience which ultimately involved the whole of Christ. William Tyndale, in the mid-1520s, heartily agreed with his Wittenberg master. His translation into English of several of Luther's sermons and the reformer's Introduction to Romans left no doubt as to his views on salvation.[107] But there was a humanist strand in Tyndale which would not leave him, and when he began to work on his translation of the Pentateuch in the 1530s, the humanistic search for excellence in moral philosophy took the upper hand in his thinking. Alongside the benign promises of a gracious God willing to restore undeserving man to favor, Tyndale "set the moral code demanded by a stern God whose pleasure was evoked by man's efforts to live out divine prescriptions for goodness."[108] Tyndale did not begin advocating the worth of human works *vis à vis* the nature of saving faith, for faith "remained for him prerequisite to righteousness much as a gift is prerequisite to gratitude."[109] It was not the gift which changed but the gratitude. Tyndale began to lose any understanding he might have had at first of Luther's law-gospel concept, and pursued the course of the necessity of law in order to show the validity and reliability of faith. Perhaps it would not be an overstatement to say Tyndale subsequently became "moralistic" in his concept of faith and its role in salvation, for after 1532, most of his energies were spent on the "sanctification aspect" rather than the "justification aspect" of salvation.

---

[106] For the best analysis of Luther's doctrine of salvation in English, see E. G. Rupp, The Righteousness of God (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1953), especially pp. 158ff.

[107] It should be pointed out nevertheless that Tyndale did not completely agree with, or perhaps misunderstood, Luther in his translation of Luther's works during the 1520s. L. J. Trinterud has shown that Tyndale's first allegiance was to the biblical-humanist tradition, and that this allegiance can be seen in Tyndale's various translations. See "William Tyndale's Debt to Martin Luther," Church History (March, 1962), pp. 24-45. The point still remains, however, that Tyndale's concept of the covenant and its relationship to faith and ethics only showed itself when he began to work on the Pentateuch. If Tyndale failed to understand (from the standpoint of agreement) Luther's notion of freedom from the law in his earlier work of translation, it is surely true that his view of the relationship of faith to works (law) was drastically changed in the 1530s.

For Calvin, justification by faith must be considered "the main hinge on which religion turns."[110] He agreed with Luther on everything the Wittenberger said about man's inability to save himself and the need for divine justification by grace through faith. Contrary to Tyndale, Calvin taught that sanctification is not the purpose of justification, for both remain independent, and Christ justifies no one whom he does not sanctify at the same time.[111] Sanctification will never become a perfect reality in the Christian whereas justification is perfect from its inception.[112] Thus we continue to be sinners even while we are being progressively sanctified, and thus there is a continual need for penitence.[113] But Calvin could not resist the temptation, any more than Bucer, to develop from his notion of sanctification a complete practical morality. Thus the Christian can derive from the scriptures a rule of conduct for his daily life and his advancement on the path to holiness.[114] The gift of faith enables the Christian to become sorrowful for his sinful condition, but God has promised his constant presence in his life which allows the believer to deny himself, purge out his sin and direct his whole attitude toward the life to come.[115]

---

[108] Clebsch, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

[109] *Ibid.*

[110] *Institutes*, III, 11, 1.

Cranmer's Homilies echo much of Calvin's teaching, although there is not much likelihood that the Archbishop borrowed from Calvin. Cranmer asserts that because all men are sinners and breakers of God's law, no man by his own acts or works can justify himself, and therefore he must search for another righteousness other than his own. The righteousness of God, to be received by God's mercy and Christ's merits, is embraced by faith. Man is therefore justified by God's grace alone through faith alone. Christ offered his life as a ransom for us and, in addition, fulfilled the law for us perfectly, a task we were helpless to do. All of these merits of Christ are accessible by faith, faith in the merits of Christ, which is not our's really, but God's working in us.

---

[111] Ibid., III, 16, 1.

[112] Ibid., III, 11, 6.

[113] Cf. Wendel, p. 243.

[114] Institutes, III, 6, 1.

[115] Cf. Wendel, p. 247.

But justification by faith does not occur without the fear of God, true repentance, hope, charity and dread. It cannot be said of the justified man that he remains idle after his justification "and that nothing should be required on our parts afterward."[116] The proposition that we are justified by faith only, freely, and without works, "as being insufficient to deserve our justification at God's hands,"[117] does not mean that we pass the time of this present life unfruitfully and idly. For that faith which brings forth evil works or no works at all is not a "right, pure, and lively faith, but a dead, devilish, counterfeit, and feigned faith."[118] Thus the right and true Christian faith is not only to believe the articles of the historic Christian tradition (assensus) but also to have a sure trust and confidence (fiducia) in God's merciful promises, "to be saved from everlasting damnation by Christ: whereof doth follow a loving heart to obey his commandments."[119]

---

[116] Thomas Cranmer, Homily of Salvation, in Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, edited for the Parker Society by John Edmund Cox (Cambridge: The University Press, 1846), p. 131.

[117] Ibid.

Thus it appears that Cranmer would agree with Tyndale to a considerable extent. However, such an assessment is not entirely fair because of the nature of the biblical materials with which each man dealt. It was Tyndale's discovery of the law in the Old Testament which made him retreat to his humanist past and to accommodate his baptism into Luther to the striving for moral perfection. Cranmer did not deal with the Old Testament in the same way, although a guess may be hazarded that he would have come to basically the same conclusion had he done so.

The exiles, however, did deal with the same materials Tyndale used and came to basically the same conclusion. The positions of Luther and Calvin are not directly reflected in the theology of the Geneva Bible, although it must be said that it is considerably closer to Calvin than to Luther. There is no simul justus et peccator of the believer, according to the exiles, but justification by faith alone is evidenced by good works as the tree is known by its fruit. Our works may be evil, but God through our faith in Christ purifies them so that we may press on toward holiness and perfection as the achievable goal of the true Christian life. The exiles' view of man corresponds to Luther's view, but their notion of faith lacks the comprehensiveness which was characteristic of the Wittenberger. Both Tyndale and Calvin allowed their humanist past to filter into their views of salvation; Luther did not. It was doubtless the humanist past of the exiles which caused them to side with the more "moralistic" notions of Tyndale.

---

[118] Ibid., p. 133.

[119] Ibid.

Thus there again is considerable similarity between the theology of the exiles and Calvin's thought, but obviously not enough to offset their indebtedness to their own English Protestant tradition.

Word of God

For Luther the key which opened the lock of the scriptures was Christ. The scriptures could not be understood apart from the aid of the Holy Spirit. Thus Luther did not conceive of the Word of God the way the exiles did. For Luther the canon was justification by faith; for the exiles it was the sixty-six books of the Old and New Testaments.

Calvin's doctrine of the knowledge of God involved his view of the scriptures. No one, he claimed, "can even get the slightest taste of right and sound doctrine unless he be a pupil of Scripture."[120] But the scriptures are not a cold letter, and one must have faith in order to understand them. God was hidden from man until he was revealed in Jesus Christ, and it is the Bible which bears witness to this revelation. The Holy Spirit puts us in contact with the Word of God so that we may discover this word in the scriptures and accept it as coming from God.

> For as God alone is a fit witness of himself in his Word, so also the Word will not find acceptance in men's hearts before it is sealed by the inward testimony of the Spirit. The same Spirit, therefore, who has spoken through the mouths of the prophets, must penetrate into our hearts to persuade us that they faithfully proclaimed what had been divinely commanded.[121]

Thus, for Calvin, the Holy Spirit's interior witness becomes the supreme criterion upon which the authority of the scriptures is founded, and this stress on the interior witness of the Spirit is affirmed with growing conviction in the successive editions of the Institutes.[122] Calvin's canon rested upon the witness of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the reader of the scriptures to assure him that he is confronting the Word of God.

---

[120] Institutes, I, 6, 2.

[121] Ibid., I, 7, 4.

[122] Wendel, p. 158.

But the exiles, following Tyndale, owed more to the humanist tradition. The Bible was a book of propositions, precepts and laws to be obeyed, a source of the *philosophia christi*, which when read and obeyed, brought man to the fullest possible knowledge of God. They may have been influenced by Calvin to the extent that they worked within the presupposition of the interior witness of the Spirit, but such a presupposition never comes into clear focus in the annotations of the Geneva Bible. Rather, it appears that they held to a view similar to Erasmus, that revelation awaits the man who in honesty and diligence *reads* and *understands* the Bible.[123]

It would be a mistake to attribute the doctrine of the Word of God found in the notes of the Geneva Bible to Calvin and the influence of Geneva. Again it must be pointed out that the exiles brought with them to Geneva their own theological tradition, bolstered by a strong humanist emphasis, and that their stay in Geneva did not alter their basic view of the scriptures. In fact, it was the Bible which was paramount to them, for it was the one source they followed without hesitation. As a result of this biblicism they often found their ideas in conflict, but, to them, this was a worthy price to pay. Neither Luther nor Calvin were willing to pay the same price.

---

[123] For an informative analysis of the humanist tradition in early Tudor Cambridge, see H. C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1958). It was this humanist tradition, ultimately going back to Erasmus, which set the stage for much of the English Reformation. The exiles were heirs of this tradition, Gilby and Sampson both having been educated at Cambridge, and it was not long before it had exercised a most profound influence upon their theological development.

The Lord's Supper

It should be obvious that the exiles would have had little to do with Luther's doctrine of the eucharist. It smacked of the corruption of Rome, and Luther was in error for not abandoning the ludicrous doctrine of transubstantiation. Feeling thus, the exiles swung the proverbial pendulum quite to the left of Luther. Their view of the Lord's Supper would have been more at home in Zurich than either Wittenberg or Strasburg.

To understand the position of the exiles it will be necessary to compare the views of Bucer, Martyr and Calvin, with that of the exiles. The account of Bucer's eucharistic thinking throughout his busy career is enigmatic, for the Strasburger seemed to pass through different phases of belief, from a Zwinglian persuasion early in his career to a more Lutheran stance on the "real presence" during the years of his interest in reconciliation of Zwinglian and Lutheran circles. Most of the commentaries written by Bucer were written during his Zwinglian period, and if there is any influence of

Bucer on the exiles' view of the Lord's Supper, it would probably be his biblical commentaries.[124]

There are several notions advocated by Bucer in his early thinking identical to the ideas brought out in the Geneva Bible and the thought of both Gilby and Sampson. One notion is the "unprofitability of the flesh" taken from the statement of John, "the flesh profiteth nothing." From this statement Bucer deduced the principle that the Supper was of no value without faith. *Est* was equivalent to *significat*, Bucer said, and the words of the eucharist, when repeated, do not change the elements into the literal body and blood of Christ. The elements were merely symbols. Thus the believer's participation in the Supper was a spiritual feeding on Christ, for Christ's body was in heaven, and the memorial service provided the opportunity to nourish and feed our spirits on Christ by faith.[125]

But Bucer had the ability to make himself unclear. Often it seemed that he made vague statements to avoid hard feelings, to pursue a middle course in order to find sympathy from the two circles on either side of him. After 1528, however, he began to try to understand Luther's view of the Lord's Supper, and this began his more Lutheran period in which he makes several questionable affirmations of the "real and substantial presence" of Christ in the elements, even to the point of ultimately admitting that those who partake of the elements without faith nevertheless receive, at least to some degree, the efficacy of Christ's body and blood. But it must be understood that these affirmations were made in the heat of ecumenical compromise when reconciliation seemed the greater virtue than clarity. Bucer's eucharistic thought cannot be properly understood without a knowledge of the different phases of his thought and the context of conciliatory statements to both Zwinglian and Lutheran circles.

---

[124] It should be pointed out that Bucer otherwise immeasurably influenced the English reformers with many of his literary works, notably his *Censura* and *De Regno Christi*. See Constantin Hopf, *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946). The best source in English of Bucer's life and thought, although the latter is not given the treatment needed in such a work, is Hastings Eells, *Martin Bucer* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1931). For Bucer's development in the struggle over the Lord's Supper, see especially pp. 70ff.

[125] *Ibid.*, pp. 85-86.

Peter Martyr's view closely resembles Bucer's early period, and both men felt they were in mutual agreement with the other's position. Martyr seemed more intent on certain terms which should be used in speaking of the Supper, but Bucer felt that squabbling over terminology was useless, as long as it was mutually understood that the Supper pertained to salvation. Martyr thought the only way that scripture allows and knows the eating of the body and blood of Christ is by a firm faith that Jesus Christ is the Savior and Lord of his body, the church, so that "he dwells in us and we in Him."[126] So that this may be accomplished to help our infirmity, Christ added in the Supper bread and wine for signs, which are made sacraments by his words and institution, "that is, organs by which the Holy Spirit excites faith in our minds, that by this we may be spiritually yet truly fed and sustained by his Body and blood. . . ."[127] At the Colloquy of Poissy, 1561, Martyr affirmed that the body and blood of Christ were "really and substantially only in the heavens, yet the faithful truly receive, spiritually and through faith, the communication of His true body and His true blood."[128] The Lord's Supper is a heavenly matter, and although we partake of the bread and wine by the mouth of the body, our faith and the work of the Holy Spirit in our souls enable us to be carried up into heaven for communion "to enjoy the present body and blood of Christ."[129] In his Loci Communes, published in Latin in 1576, Martyr says:

> We ought not to confound the nature of the signs together with the things signified. Let us follow the mean and sound way; and let us judge honorably of the sacraments; not thinking them to be things altogether void of spiritual goodness. Neither let

---

[126] From the Preface to Martyr's Tractatio de Sacramento Eucharistiae, 1549, printed in McLelland, Appendix D.

[127] Ibid.

[128] Ibid., cf. p. 287.

[129] Ibid.

> us so join the signs with the things, as they did altogether pass unto them. If sufficeth there to appoint a profitable and most excellent signification, whereby the faithful mind, through believing, may be made partaker of the things signified.[130]

Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper is as close to Bucer's mature Lutheran phase as Martyr is to Bucer's early Zwinglian phase, yet it would be difficult to show any great contradistinctions between the positions of the three reformers. Calvin seemed to owe most of his thinking to Augustine and Bucer, the latter playing the dominant role. In 1536, Calvin wrote,

> The corporal things presented to us in the sacraments ought to lead us to spiritual things by way of analogy. Thus when we see that the bread is presented to us as the sign of the body of Christ, we should at once recall this similitude: that just as bread nourishes, sustains and strengthens the life of our body, even so is the body of Christ the nourishment and protection of our spiritual life.[131]

In the 1559 Institutes, the reflection of Calvin's mature thought, he says that in the Supper, Christ is truly given to us, under the signs of the bread and wine, and that Christians receive his body and blood "in which he has fulfilled all obedience to obtain righteousness for us."[132]

---

[130] The Common Places of the most famous and renowned Divine Doctor Peter Martyr. . . , translated and gathered by Anthonie Marten, 1583 (no colophon), p. 590.

[131] From Opera omnia quae supersunt, 1, 119, quoted in Wendel, p. 332.

[132] Institutes, IV, 17, 11.

Thus the benefits of Christ come to those who partake of the Supper by faith. Christ gives himself to us by the promise of his indwelling through faith, thereby fulfilling what is promised and offered to the believer by the signs.

The signs do not contain the reality of the spiritual content of the Supper, but their function is "to point to and to confirm this promise in which Jesus Christ tells that his flesh is meat indeed and his blood drink indeed, and that they feed us with eternal life."[133] Yet the substance is also given us in its reality for in taking the sign of the body "let us no less surely trust that the body itself is also given to us."[134] Thus the spiritual reality of the body and blood of Christ is not identifiable with the signs thereof, nor is it included in them. It is given at the same time they are. The body of Christ is given to the believer "really" and "truly" as food healthful for his soul, and the soul is fed upon the substance of his body in order that it may be made one with him.[135]

In comparing Bucer, Martyr and Calvin on their doctrines of the Lord's Supper, it would be difficult to say that they represent three different poles of thought within the Reformed tradition. McLelland's analysis[136] is not far from right, for he points out that although there may be differences of emphasis the three are characteristically and basically the same. What is most striking is that Lutherans could agree with Bucer and Zwinglians with Martyr, yet Bucer and Martyr were conscious of being in substantial agreement on the Supper. And, since the doctrine of Calvin reflects the essence of the positions of both Bucer and Martyr (although in terminology closer to Bucer) it can be said that "the more comprehensive and influential theology of John Calvin was representative of the Reformation as a whole as no other could be."[137]

---

[133] Ibid., IV, 17, 4, translation in Wendel, p. 338.

[134] Ibid., IV, 17, 10.

[135] Opera, 49, 487. Cf. Wendel, p. 340.

Thomas Cranmer stands within this same tradition. It is difficult to assess exactly the concrete sources of Cranmer's eucharistic theology, but it is safe to say that he learned much from Bucer, Martyr, Ridley and Calvin. The following three quotations from two representative works show Cranmer's true position.

> . . . Christ sayeth of the bread, 'This is my body,' and of the cup he sayeth, 'This is my blood.' Wherefore we ought to believe, in the sacrament we receive truly the body and blood of Christ. For God is almighty. . . . He is able therefore, to do all things what he will. . . . Wherefore when Christ

---

[136] McLelland, pp. 272ff.

[137] *Ibid.*, p. 278.

> taketh bread . . . we ought not to doubt, but we eat his very body. And when he taketh the cup . . . we ought to think assuredly, that we drink his very blood. And this we must believe, if we will be counted christian men. . . .[138]

> God grant that, all contention set aside, both the parties may come to this holy communion with such a lively faith in Christ, and such an unfeigned love to all Christ's members, that as they carnally eat with their mouths this sacramental bread, and drink the wine, so spiritually they may eat and drink the very flesh and blood of Christ which is in heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father. . . .[139]

> This therefore is the sum of my teaching . . . that in the true ministration of the sacrament Christ is present spiritually, and so spiritually eaten of them that be godly and spiritual. And as for the ungodly and carnal, they may eat the bread and drink the wine, but with Christ himself they have no communion or company; and therefore they neither eat his flesh nor drink his blood, which whosoever eateth hath . . . life by him, as Christ hath life by his Father. . . . For whether Christ be in the sacrament corporally, as you say, or spiritually in them that rightly believe in him, and duly receive the sacrament, as I say, yet certain it is, that there he is not eaten corporally, but spiritually.[140]

It should be clear that the exiles, although similar in many points, do not reflect the doctrine of the Lord's

---

[138] Cathechismvs, that is to say a Shorte Instruction into Christian Religion, set forth by the mooste reuerende father in God Thomas Archbyshop of Canterbury, 1548 (no colophon), fol. ccxxxv, recto-verso. This catechism was a translation of the Latin catechism of Justus Jonas, and was of course accused of being Lutheran. The extent to which Cranmer's translation "softened" the sense of the real presence needs researching.

[139] Thomas Cranmer, in his answer to A Crafty and Sophistical Cavillation, devised by S. Gardiner, 1550 in Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, edited for the Parker Society by John Edmund Cox (Cambridge: The University Press, 1844), p. 30.

[140] Ibid., p. 203.

Supper of this tradition. This is not to say they could not live and preach within it, for Whittingham thought enough of Ridley's treatise to write a preface to it. But that they were closer to Zurich and Hooper[141] seems hardly contestable. In the final analysis, it was Gilby's view of the Lord's Supper which received corroboration in the annotations of the Geneva Bible. His emphasis on the distinction between a sign and what it signifies, eating Christ's body only spiritually and not bodily, really or carnally, for the refreshing of our souls, and his lack of emphasis on partaking by faith, ultimately found their way into the Geneva Bible. Thus, Calvin had very little influence on the exiles' doctrine of the Lord's Supper, again showing their relative independence of the Genevan reformer.

The "Deuteronomic View of History"

Perhaps the real distinctions between Luther and Calvin on the one hand, and Calvin and Tyndale on the other, are seen in no clearer light than in their respective treatments of the Pentateuch, particularly Deuteronomy. It is here that the whole theology of a man gets an opportunity to show itself in its most creative role.

---

[141] Cf: Don S. Ross, The Role of John Hooper in the Religious Controversies of the Reign of Edward VI in England, unpublished thesis, University of Iowa, 1968. Notice also that the exiles' view closely resembled the view of the author of The Soupper of the Lorde (1533), long attributed to Tyndale but probably written by George Joye.

Upon reading Luther's Commentary on Deuteronomy one easily gets the impression that the reformer loved doing this piece. After giving some technical and philological information, each chapter is then turned into an allegory which Luther constructed for the benefit of the Christian reader. Each allegory typifies his whole theological system, his whole orientation, both as to his view of man coram deo, and the wonderful work of God in Christ through justification. As an example, his allegory on Deuteronomy 4 may be taken as typical of his whole treatment.

That Moses does not cross over the Jordan to the Land of Promise, but is commanded to turn his leadership role over to another leader, is an outstanding lesson that the law leads nothing to perfection, for the law does not give the Spirit of grace, and therefore it does not lead into the kingdom of God. Moses killed two kings on this side of Jordan, which to Luther signifies that the law humbles sinners, shows them that they are slain, and leaves nothing alive, since it leads to hell and is the ministry of death. Cattle and goods, however, are safe; they come in as booty. For the law does not kill the man bodily, but it kills the trust of his heart; when that is dead, then a man surrenders whatever he is and has to the service of the law as booty, and the "miserable wretch" lives with all his powers as a captive of the law. But since the law does not preach forgiveness of the sin which it had provoked through its ministry, it is forced to die in the land of Moab outside the kingdom of God--thus the whole law collapses and nothing is left of him who has placed his fate in it. Joshua, however, denotes Christ, because of his name and because of what he does, leading the people into and parceling out the inheritance of the Lord.

> Thus Christ, who was first made under the Law . . . served it for us; then, when it was ended, He established another ministry, that of the Gospel, by which we are led through Him into the spiritual kingdom of a conscience joyful and serene in God, where we reign forever.[142]

Calvin's treatment of the Pentateuch is no less typical. The story of Israel's defection and weakness should serve to teach us many beneficial lessons. The incomparable wisdom and power of God is seen in his merciful treatment of a decadent people. He has stayed with them inspite of their ingratitude; he has shown his mercy to them as a manifest proof of his loving-kindness and constant government of their destiny; he has shown in his cherishing, defending, honoring and preserving those whom he has once embraced with his love, his inestimable fatherly concern for an undeserving people.[143]

---

[142] Luther, Commentary on Deuteronomy, pp. 42-43.

[143] John Calvin, Commentaries on the four last books of Moses, translated by Charles W. Bingham (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Company, 1950), Vol. I, p. xv.

When Calvin preached on Deuteronomy, he found the basis for admonishing his hearers to cast themselves down before the face of their God, acknowledging their faults and beseeching their Maker to make them better than they had been heretofore, "that we may be led to a true and earnest repentance, that he will mortify us more and more, cutting off our evil and disordered affections, to the end we may be wholly given to fear and honor him."[144] If Christians are to profit from the law of God they must have "respect of the vices and imperfections" within them, endeavoring by all their might and power to root them out. Even this is not enough, for God will not have us idle in the world; we must not only abstain from all evil but we must apply ourselves to do as our Maker has ordained.[145] Although we will fall short, our only course is to fall prostrate at his feet and pray that even our weak efforts will please him to receive us into his mercy and bear with us by his Spirit. Ravished thereby, the hearers are exhorted to continue the fight against the things of this world and the lusts and affections thereof, so that by his mercy, and according to his Word, he may be pleased to change and transfigure them into the image of his eternal likeness.[146]

---

[144] Sermons of Iohn Caluine upon the Christian Commandments of the Lawe . . . when he preached on Deuteronomie, translated from the French by I. H. (London: Thomas Woodcocke, 1579), fol. 14, verso.

[145] Ibid., fol. 59, recto.

It has already been pointed out that William Tyndale changed his basic "Lutheran" orientation after he began to work on the translation of the Pentatuech in the 1530s. In addition to succumbing to the notion of the necessity of law for the believer, Tyndale was able to read the Pentateuch as a reflective history of his own country. Thus it should not be surprising to find the beginnings of what has been already referred to as the "Deuteronomic view of history" in Tyndale's work on the Pentateuch.

In his preface to the Book of Exodus Tyndale advises the readers to note the mighty hand of God, "how he playeth with his adversaries and provoketh them and stireth them up a little and a little, and delivereth not his people in an hour." God thus wants the elect to be patient and their enemies to be aware of the futility of fighting against his policies.[147] Tyndale distinguishes the Old from the New Testament by showing that the Old Testament "is those temporal promises which God made the children of Israel of a good land and that he would defend them" with wealth and prosperity if they would obey his law. The Old Testament was built altogether "upon the keeping of the law and ceremonies and was the reward of keeping of them in this life only" so that if the law of God is properly kept, punishments in this life may be avoided. Man of his own accord, must therefore obey the law of God by bringing forth good works without fear of threatenings or cursing.[148] Tyndale concludes his preface to Exodus by saying that when the people keep the temporal laws of their land "temporal prosperity and all manner of such temporal blessing as thou readest of in Moses do accompany them and fall upon them." But when the people sin and when the rulers have no respect for "natural equity and honesty" God sends his curses among them, such as "hunger, derth, more banging, pestilence, war, oppression with strange and wonderful diseases and new kinds of misfortune and evil luck."[149]

---

[146] *Ibid.*, fol. 125, recto.

[147] *William Tyndale's Five Books of Moses called The Pentateuch*, being a verbatim reprint of the edition of *M.CCCCC.XXX.* (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1967), p. 162.

But Deuteronomy was the book which Christians should read day and night, never taking it "out of hands," for it is the "most excellent of all the books of Moses."[150] For Tyndale, Deuteronomy contained the "very pure gospel" and "a preaching of faith and love."[151] Deuteronomy shows the benefits of God done for his people, Israel, in order that they might be provoked to love and good works. God cursed and sent his plagues of wrath upon Israel's enemies that he might show the perversity of the appetites of the flesh. Israel was nurtured in the providence of God, but they must not go beyond the boundaries of God's Word, "but to be diligent only to keep them in remembrance and in the heart and to teach their children, for fear of forgetting."[152] The children of Israel are warned to keep from worshipping idols, but should they fall, or should God bring them into trouble and adversity, "if they repent and turn, he promiseth them that God shall remember his mercy and receive them to grace again."[153]

---

[148] Ibid., p. 167.

[149] Ibid., p. 168.

[150] Ibid., p. 517.

[151] Ibid.

But it was the twenty-eighth chapter which should cause the most sorrow in the hearts of readers, for the mere reading of it should provoke concern and despair, "for fear of the wrath that is like to come upon us according unto all the curses which thou there readest."[154] For God will deal with all nations in like manner. Tyndale would advise his countrymen that God so deals with them for their inquity and apostasy and that the wrath of God awaits the nation that fails to render obedience to him with whom she sustains a covenant relationship.[155]

---

[152] Ibid., p. 518.

[153] Ibid.

[154] Ibid., p. 521.

It should be clear that the compilers of the Geneva Bible once again share not only the beliefs but also the methods for arriving at such beliefs with William Tyndale. This is surely true regarding their view of the church and history. But such a phenomenon is absent in the works of Luther and Calvin. Perhaps Bucer hinted at it,[156] but it was largely to Tyndale that the exiles owed their "Deuteronomic view of history".

There is one other possible source for this doctrine which may have influenced the exiles. Although he did not have the affect that Tyndale had, Peter Martyr Vermigli developed a doctrine of the church and history which shows considerable similarity to the views of the compilers. Martyr's commentary on Judges develops a similar theme which was seen in the exiles' treatment of most Old Testament books. Although the children of Israel displayed a weak faith during the period of the judges God continually delivered them "because God handled with them faithfully and by a covenant."[157] God had promised his people that they would prosper as long as they kept his laws and worshipped him. But if they should fall from their covenant with him to commit adultery with idols, casting away the laws of God, then they should be delivered into the hands of their enemies. Yet, upon their repentance the covenant would once more be renewed. The lessons of Judges should stir in our minds the relationship we sustain to Christ.[158] That God punished "wandering and unlawful lusts" of many men in Israel's time should help us to understand that "now also throughout all Christendom such free and wandering filthy lust reign everywhere," and there is nothing awaiting "this our world" but the most sharp punishments.[159]

---

[155] That Tyndale had in mind the English nation is clear from the prologue of his translation of Jonah. Cf. _The Prophete Jonas with an introduccion before teachinge to understood him_, Antwerp, 1531?, especially fol. Biii, recto-Civ, verso.

[156] Cf. e.g. Eells, p. 21.

[157] Peter Martyr Vermigli, _Most fruitfull & learned Commentaries_ (London: John Day, 1564), fol. 2, verso.

Martyr, like Tyndale, discusses the distinction between the Old and New Testaments, concluding that there is one covenant in the Old Testament and another in the New Testament. The covenant in the former shows the Jews in contract with God, the covenant of the latter, the contract of Christians with God. There may be different properties characterizing the two, but substantially they are the same.[160] Unlike Tyndale, however, Martyr does not seem to have any specific nation in mind, for the New Covenant "pertaineth not to any one certain nation, but to all nations, how far so ever the world be extended: neither is there any civil administration joined thereto."[161] Yet Christians should recall the lessons of the covenant people, Israel, to the extent that they must also "believe in the true God, and obey, and worship him as he hath prescribed."[162] The same sacraments are to be found in both covenants; even the distinction between law and gospel are found in both. Christ's mediatorship and the promise of remission of sins are shared alike in both testaments.[163] Martyr therefore concludes,

---

[158] Ibid.

[159] Ibid., fol. 4, recto. For a strikingly similar passage to the "Argument" to Judges in the 1560 Geneva Bible, see Martyr's comments on fol. 6, recto and verso.

> . . . we must wholly affirm, that one and the same covenant, between God and man, is both of the old and new testament: in the which God promised, that he would be their God, and they should be his people. This covenant they in the old testament no less had, than we in the new testament have. . . . Therefore, the tree is all one, the flock all one, the plant all one that beareth us and them. But herein is the difference; that we be branches grafted in, whereas they are natural. . . . Briefly, what difference so ever is between each testament, that doth every whit consist, not in the substance of the covenant, but in the accidents. For the principal point of the old covenant was, that the true God would be indeed our God.[164]

---

[160] Martyr, Common Places, p. 583.

[161] *Ibid.*

[162] *Ibid.*

[163] *Ibid.*, p. 586.

[164] *Ibid.*, p. 596.

The exiles shared this view of the church and history with Peter Martyr, although they laid less emphasis on the idea of the covenant relationship, especially the idea of the two covenants in the Old and New Testaments. In addition, the exiles directed their message to England whereas Martyr clearly says his message is for no one particular nation. Perhaps had Martyr been a _native_ Englishman whose heart fondly reminisced the joyous reformation under Edward VI, he too might have been more direct and specific in his message of judgment.

The State

Luther believed it was impossible that the temporal sword and law "should find any work to do among Christians, since they do of their own accord much more than all laws and teachings can demand."[165] Yet his notion of _simul justus et peccator_ caused him to believe in the necessity of the law for both Christians and non-Christians. The state is set up by God to control the wickedness of those who do harm and to provide government for those who are not in the kingdom of God. Thus it was out of the question that a common Christian government should control the whole world, "or indeed over a single country or any considerable body of people," for the wicked always outnumber the righteous. For this reason one must carefully distinguish between the two governments. One government is for the kingdom of God to produce righteousness; the other is for the majority of men to produce peace and tranquility. Neither government is sufficient in the world without the other.[166]

---

[165] _Luther's Works_, Volume 45: _The Christian in Society_, edited by Walther I. Brandt (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1962), p. 89.

The Christian submits willingly to the rule of the sword, pays his taxes, honors those in authority, serves, helps, and does all he can to assist the governing authority, "that it may continue to function and be held in honor and fear."[167] Although he has no need for these things himself, the Christian nevertheless concerns himself with them for the benefit and service of others. Luther would have those Christians under his influence "too exalted and far too noble" to have any need for civil authority, but that "it should rather have need of you."[168]

But the temporal authority should not presume to prescribe law for the kingdom of God, for this would be encroaching upon God's government "and only misleads souls and destroys them."[169] In matters which concern the salvation of souls, therefore, nothing but the Word of God shall be taught and accepted. Heresy is not a matter restrained by force, nor can the riddance of books or a certain belief be commanded by the temporal government. Priests and bishops govern in the kingdom of God, but their government is not a matter of authority or power, but "a service and an office, for they are neither higher nor better than other Christians."[170] They should impose no law or decree on others without their will and consent.

---

[166] Ibid., p. 91-92.

[167] Ibid., p. 94.

[168] Ibid., p. 95.

[169] Ibid., p. 105.

William Tyndale would have concurred with most of Luther's thinking on the relationship of the Christian to the state. In his Homily of Obedience, Tyndale wrote:

> Almighty God hath created and appointed all things in heaven and earth in a most excellent and perfect order. In heaven he hath appointed distinct and several orders of arch-angels and angels. In earth he hath assigned kings, princes and other governors, under them in all good and necessary order . . . every degree of people in their vocation, calling and office . . . hath appointed unto them their duty and order: some are in high degree, some in low, some kings and princes, some inferiors and subjects, priests and laymen, masters and servants, fathers and children, husbands and wives, rich and poor: and every one hath need of other: so that in all things is to be lauded and praised the goodly order of God without which no house, no city, no commonwealth can endure or last.[171]

Yet Tyndale's idea of the state was not so much the preservative against chaos, as in the case of Luther, but the execution of the law of God. The law of God should be the king's law, and whatever is done by rulers and princes should be considered God's action, whether it be good or bad.[172] Governments and their governors are the instruments of God to affect the divine rule in the world. This is true even when rulers abuse their office.[173] Thus obedience to the "powers that be", even a heathen ruler, is incumbent upon Christians. But God will punish the tyrannical ruler in his own time, and the Christian must always seek to obey God first rather than men. Tyndale affirms that there remains a distinction between the Christian ruler and the alien ruler, but the difference is not in the office but in the person holding the office. The office is God's way of bringing his will into the world of human affairs. Christian and alien rulers alike function for God's will in this respect. But outside his office the Christian ruler is bound to frame his actions in the spirit of Christ and by Christian principles.

---

[170] Ibid., p. 117.

[171] Quoted in E. G. Rupp, Studies in the English Protestant Tradition (Cambridge: The University Press, 1966), p. 74.

Tyndale's "Deuteronomic view of history" caused him to see the office of the ruler as an office of law.

> In time of judgment he is no minister in the Kingdom of Christ: he preacheth no Gospel, but the sharp law of vengeance. Let him take the holy judges of the Old Testament for an ensample and

---

[172] William Tyndale, Doctrinal Treatises and Introductions to Different Portions of the Holy Scriptures, edited for the Parker Society by Henry Walter (Cambridge: The University Press, 1848), p. 194.

[173] *Ibid.*, pp. 194-95.

> namely Moses which in executing the law was merciless: otherwise more than a mother to them.[174]

Thus there are some important distinctions between the views of Luther and Tyndale, although both taught Christian obedience of civil authorities. The Geneva compilers listened very little to either Luther or their own English Protestant tradition concerning the doctrine of the state.

Calvin's doctrine of the state differed from the views of both Luther and Tyndale in several important respects. Doubtless memories of Basel and Strasburg were a constant influence on his views. Especially Bucer's influence regarding the rigidity of an autonomous discipline within the church haunted his mind as he made plans to build the church in Geneva around a similar format. Yet he is careful to mark the differences that separate the spiritual jurisdiction from temporal jurisdiction, for the "Church does not have the right of the sword to punish or compel, not the authority to force; not imprisonment, nor the other punishments which the magistrate commonly inflicts."[175] The church should not exercise a repressive and authoritarian power, but it should safeguard good order among its members and perform an educational service for their benefit. If there is a Christian magistrate, this too should be his goal. But the two tribunals of the spiritual and temporal realms have separate domains which nevertheless complement one another.[176]

---

[174] *Ibid.*, p. 203.

[175] *Institutes*, IV, 11, 3.

Moreover, the civil magistrate must see to it that the laws of God are respected, but he is to do it in a sphere proper to his office, just as the church, for its part, should see that they are observed in the spiritual domain. Calvin presumably never wanted to set up a theocratic state which would be under the oversight of the church, but he did visualize a system of close collaboration between the two powers in which each contributed successfully its own part and reciprocated aid wherever possible. The ministers of the church should seek to contribute to the moral education of the citizens and to explain to the civil rulers the requirements of the Word of God, to which the civil magistrate must conform. The magistrates should promote respect for the Word of God and the protection of the church.[177]

Thus it would appear that although there are several important differences between Luther and Calvin, Calvin would agree for the most part with Luther's position. Perhaps he is somewhat closer to Tyndale's view, but his experiences with Bucer in Strasburg had a great influence on him, even to the extent of setting up the "perfect society" in Geneva where the Word of God would reign supreme and the Reformation allowed to follow its sternest course.

---

[176] Cf. Wendel, p. 309.

[177] Ibid., p. 310.

The view of the state in the annotations of the Geneva Bible is perhaps closer to the views of Tyndale and Calvin than to the view of Luther. But proximity is rather meaningless in this case, for the "open resistence" views of Knox and Goodman have no parallel in any of the thinkers observed in this thesis. Once again, Calvin's influence is minimal; the exiles' view of obedience to the civil authorities was their own, of a type quite different from the views of John Calvin.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has been primarily an examination of the theology of the annotations and prefaces of the 1560 Geneva Bible. Since this version of the English Bible was so popular in sixteenth and seventeenth century England, and since this popularity was due in a large degree to the annotations and prefaces of the Bible, an understanding of the basic presuppositions and doctrines which the translators brought to their task should provide the reader sufficient reasons for the necessity of such a project. There has been a considerable interest of late in the Geneva Bible among Reformation historians. Its popularity, its place of origin, its distinctive theology, have been topics which have recently received no little attention. However, the groundwork of the examination of the annotations and prefaces has been done only on a limited scale. This study has contributed to the area of Reformation studies a more thorough and historical analysis of the theology of the Geneva Bible.

Within the chapter divisions, it has been shown that the historical background of the 1560 Geneva Bible provides many enlightening facts relating to its origin and popularity. After the extensive examination and categorization of the annotations and prefaces themselves, the distinctive theology of this amazing edition of the Bible can be seen in clearer light by a comparison with both its Continental and English Protestant traditions.

The conclusions which this thesis has uncovered are many and of varying consequence. The first chapter shows that the translators who contributed most to the version were William Whittingham, Anthony Gilby and Thomas Sampson, and that although Knox, Goodman and Coverdale probably had their influence on the final product, it was primarily the work of the trio of Whittingham, Gilby and Sampson which was ultimately incorporated into the translation. Whittingham's New Testament of 1557 provided a precedent for the 1560 edition, but the text and translation of the 1557 edition were changed considerably in light of the trio's use of Beza's Latin translation. Many of the notes Whittingham appended to his New Testament are found in the annotations of the 1560 edition, but the latter is fuller and of considerably more detail both in scope and content. The popularity of the 1560 edition was due also to its size and format, and not to any special treatment by Elizabeth's via media under Parker's archbishopric. The Geneva Bible became the Bible of the home in the 1560s and 70s. But beginning in 1575, it began to be published in tremendous quantities, and although it ran through several editions and revisions, such as the revision of Tomson, the annotated Bible of 1560 became the most popular

Bible in England. Even the Authorized Version had a difficult time supplanting it, for many King James Versions were subsequently printed with the annotations of the 1560 Geneva Bible!

The second chapter is the heart of the study, for here are uncovered the doctrines which the translators adumbrated throughout the annotations. It was shown that one of the primary concerns of the translators was the divine sovereignty of God, a theme which became the foundation of their views of God, predestination and salvation. Predestination is presented in a full-blown "double" form. The revelation of God is perceived as the sixty-six canonical books of the Bible, and the stress on reading and understanding the Bible shows the exiles' typically English view of scripture as being the law of God. Their notions of faith and ethics reflect both Lutheran and Erasmian strands of tradition, for man can be justified only by faith, but faith must show itself in good works; faith is the cause of justification, good works are the effect. The Bible as the law of God is the source for all religious thought and activity, and a continual striving for perfection, even to the extent of bodily and spiritual mortification, is realizable for the child of God. Yet man is helpless to make any kind of move toward God without God first making his move; it was only by the grace of God in choosing his elect that he could hear the Word of the Spirit and respond to God in faith.

The most distinctive contribution of the Geneva Bible is its inherent view of the church and history. In this thesis the phrase "Deuteronomic view of history" is used to show the particular view of God's contractual relationship with England the exiles incorporated into the prefaces and annotations. The translators saw in the blessings and cursings that God gave Israel, in accordance with their obedience to the covenant relationship, a parable for their own times. God was expecting of the people of England the reformation of religion. He would be faithful to his contract with them if they would obey his law. But if England were unfaithful, if idolatry and ceremonialism continued to go unchecked, only the fate of a fallen Israel awaited it.

The exiles incorporated the views of Goodman and Knox on civil disobedience into their view of the state, although their language is not as stern and reactionary. They brought a "sacramentarian" interpretation of the Lord's Supper to the biblical text, and their view of the Supper resembled Zurich more than either Wittenberg or Strasburg. They also incorporated, owing to their humanist past, an "anti-Rome" polemic into their annotations wherever and whenever it was possible.

Since many historians have contended that the Geneva Bible reflects the influence of Calvin and Geneva it was necessary, in the third chapter, to compare the theology of the 1560 edition with both Continental and English Protestantism. An examination of some of the literary efforts of Whittingham, Gilby and Sampson prior to the translation of the Geneva Bible reveals that Calvin's influence was not as considerable as has been heretofor supposed. The doctrines of the Lord's Supper, the church and history and the state clearly reflect a different tradition than Geneva. Only on the matter of predestination and salvation might there be a Calvinist influence. Yet even this has been called into question to the extent that Calvin's influence would have had to have its effect on Gilby, Sampson and Whittingham prior to their coming to Geneva in 1555. This is especially true in the case of Gilby, whose doctrines reflect those of the Geneva Bible more than either Whittingham's or Sampson's. The one clear debt the exiles owed to Calvin is the matter of the Genevan church order.

The continuity between the theology of the Geneva Bible and that of William Tyndale is unmistakable. Tyndale's view of scripture as the law of God, his "Deuteronomic view of history" and his emphasis on the redemptive aspect of good works are shared by the translators of the 1560 edition of the Geneva Bible.

Luther's influence is minimal. The exiles shared with the Wittenberger the doctrine of justification by faith, but their humanist background caused them to pursue a similar course with Tyndale, and the result was a certain "moralistic" view of faith and ethics. The one matter where the exiles departed from Tyndale (and Luther) was the doctrine of the state. Here they followed the notions of Goodman and Knox, advocating open resistence to those governments which suppressed the freedom of the common man and the propagation of "true religion".

There are many areas of similarity between Calvin and the exiles, but in no case is it clear that they borrowed from the Genevan reformer their distinctive theological ideas. This is not to say they were not indebted to him in many ways. What has been shown is that the theology the translators brought with them to Geneva, owing especially to Erasmian humanism and their own English Protestant tradition, was amenable to the intellectual and theological climate of Geneva.

Thus the two theses which have been at work throughout this thesis have been shown to have more than substantial corroboration. Calvin's influence on the theology of the Geneva Bible was mainly indirect and held to a minimal degree. The true source of the exiles' theology was the Bible itself. They theologized wherever it led them. The influences of Erasmus and Cambridge had the most dramatic effect on their thinking. The "Word of God", and their understanding of it, was the final authority. When they returned to the original sources of the Christian tradition the translators felt they were building on the surest of foundations.

LIST OF REFERENCES

ORIGINAL SOURCES

Barlow, William. *The Summe and Substance*. Gainsville, Florida: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1965.

Calvin, John. *Commentaries on the four last books of Moses*, translated by Charles W. Bingham. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Co., 1950. Volume I.

________. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, edited by John T. McNeill and translated by Ford Lewis Battles. Philadelphia: The Westminister Press, 1960. Two Volumes.

________. *Sermons of Iohn Caluine upon the Christian Commandments of the Lawe . . . when he preached on Deuteronomie*, translated from the French by I. H. London: Thomas Woodcocke, 1579.

Cardwell, Edward. *Documentary Annals of ~~the~~ Reformed Church of England*. Oxford: The University Press, 1844. Volume I.

Cathechismvs, that is to say a Shorte Instruction into Christian Religion, set forth by the mooste reuerende father in God Thomas Archbyshop of Canterbury. 1548 (no colophon).

Certen godly, learned, and/ comfortable conferences, betwene the two Reuerende Fathers, and holye Martyrs of/ Christe, D. Nicolas Rydley late Bysshoppe/ of London, and M. Hughe Latymer/ Sometyme Bysshoppe of Wor-/cester, during the tyme of/ theyr empryson-/ mentes./ Whereunto is added./ A Treatise agayst the errour of Transubstan-/tiation, made by the sayd Reuerende Father D./ Nicolas Rydley./ M.D. LVI (no colophon).

Coverdale, Miles. *The Bible/ that is, the holy Scripture of the Olde and New Testament, faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn in to English.* M.D.XXXVII. . . . Prynted in Southwarke by James Nicolson. Set forth wyth the kynges moost gracious lycence.

Cranmer, Thomas. *Answer to A Crafty and Sophistical Cavillation, devised by S. Gardiner, 1550,* in *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer,* edited for the Parker Society by John Edmund Cox. Cambridge: The University Press, 1844.

________. *Homily of Salvation in Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer,* edited for the Parker Society by John Edmund Cox. Cambridge: The University Press, 1846.

Fulke, William. *A Defence of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holy Scripture into the English Tongue,* edited for the Parker Society by Charles H. Hartshorne. Cambridge: The University Press, 1843.

Gilby, Anthony. *An Admonition to England and Scotland, to call them to Repentence.* 1558 (no colophon)

________. *An Answer to the devilish detection of Stephene Gardiner, Bishoppe of Winchester.* 1547 (no colophon).

________. *A Briefe Treatise of Election and Reprobation, with certen answers to the Obiections of the aduersaries of thys doctrine.* London, 1575?
Geneva, 1556 .

________. *A Commentarye vpon the Prophet Mycah.* London, 1551.

________. *The Epistle of a Banyshed Manne out of Leycester Shire, sometyme one of the Preachers of Goddes Worde there.* 1554 (no colophon).

Goodman, Christopher. *How Superior Powers Oght to be Obeyd.* 1558. Published for The Facsimile Text Society, New York: Columbia University Press, 1931.

Junius, Francisaus. *The Apocalyps, or Revelation of S. Iohn . . . With a brief and methodicall exposition vpon euery chapter . . . Lately set forth by Fr. Dv. Ion, and newly translated into English . . .* Printed by Iohn Legat . . . , 1596.

Knox, John. *An Answer to a Great Nomber of blasphemous cauillations written by an Anabaptist, and aduersarie to Gods eternal Predestination.* Printed by Iohn Crespin, 1560.

________, *History of the Reformation in Scotland*, edited by William Croft Dickenson. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1949. Two volumes.

Laing, David. *The Works of John Knox*. Edinburgh: James Thin, 1895. Five volumes.

Luther's Works, Volume 9: *Lectures on Deuteronomy*, edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1960.

________, Volume 45: *The Christian in Society*, edited by Walter I. Brandt. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, Press, 1962.

Mitchell, A. F. (ed.) *Livre des Anglais*. (No date)

Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation . . . from the Archives of Zurich, edited for the Parker Society by Hastings Robinson. Cambridge: The University Press, 1846.

Pollard, Alfred W. *Records of the English Bible, the Documents Relating to the Translation and Publication of the Bible in English, 1525-1611*. London: Oxford University Press, 1911.

Reformed Confessions of the 16th Century, edited with historical introduction by Arthur C. Cochrane. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946.

Sampson, Thomas. *A Letter to the trew professors of Christs Gospel/ inhabitinge in the Parish off Allhallowis/ in Bredstrete in London*. Strasburg, 1554.

Sarcerius, Erasmus. *Common places of scripture orderly . . . set forth . . . to the great profyte and helpe of all such studentes in gods worde. . .*, translated into English by Richard Taverner. London, 1538.

The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe, edited by Stephen R. Cattley. London: Seeley and Burnside, 1837. Vol. III.

The Bible and Holy Scriptvres conteyned in the Olde and Newe Testament. Translated according to the Ebrue and Greke, and conferred with the best translations in diuers languages. With moste profitable annotations vpon all the hard places, and other things of great importance as may appeare in the epistle to the reader. Geneva: Printed by R. Hall, 1560.

The Common Places of the most famous and renowned Divine Doctor Peter Martyr. . . , translated and gathered by Anthonie Marten. 1583 (no colophon).

The forme of prayers and ministration of the Sacraments, &c. vsed in the Englishe Congregation at Geneva: and approued, by the famous and godly learned man, Iohn Caluyn. Imprinted at Geneva by Iohn Crespin, M.D.LVI.

The/ New Testa/ment of our Lord Ie/sus Christ./ Conferred diligently with the Greke, and best ap/proued translations./ With the argvments, aswel before the Chapters, as for euery Boke/ & Epistle, also diuersities of readings, and moste profittable/ annotations of all harde places: whereunto is added a copi-/ous Table. At Geneua/ Printed by Conrad Badius, M.D.LVII.

The New Testament . . . *translated out of the Greeke by Theod. Beza. Whereunto are adioyned briefe summaries of doctrines vpon the Euangelistes and Actes* . . . *together with the methode of the Epistles* . . . *by Theod. Beza: and also short expositions on the phrases and hard places taken out of the large annotations of the foresaid authour*. . . . *Englished by L. Tomson* . . . Imprinted at London by the deputies of Christopher Barker . . . 1597.

The Works of John Whitgift, edited for the Parker Society by John Ayre. Cambridge: The University Press, 1851. Three volumes.

Tyndale, William and George Joye. *An Answer to Sir Thomas More's Diaglogue, The Supper of the Lord . . . and Wm. Tracy's Testament Expounded*, edited for the Parker Society by Henry Walter. Cambridge: the University Press, 1850.

Tyndale, William. Doctrinal Treatises and Introductions to Different Portions of the Holy Scriptures, edited for the Parker Society by Henry Walter. Cambridge: The University Press, 1848.

________. Five Books of Moses called The Pentateuch, being a verbatim reprint of the edition of M.CCCCC.XXX. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1967.

________. The prophete Jonas with an introduccion before teachinge to understood him. Antwerp, 1531?

Vermigli, Peter Martyr. Most fruitfull & learned Commentaries. London: John Day, 1564.

Whittingham, William. A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort, 1554-1558 A.D. London: Elliot Stock, 1575.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Anderson, Chrisopher. The Annals of the English Bible, revised by Hugh Anderson. London: Jackson, Walford and Hodder, 1862.

Bardsley, Charles W. Curiosities of Puritan Nomenclature. London: Chatoo and Windus, 1897.

Bruce, F. F. The English Bible. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Butterworth, Charles C. The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible, 1340-1611. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1961.

Clebsch, William A. England's Earliest Protestants. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.

Daiches, David. The King James Version of the English Bible. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941.

Darlow, T. H. and H. F. Moule, Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society. London: The Bible House, 1903. Volume I.

Davidson, Randall T. "The Authorisation of the English Bible," *Macmillan's Magazine* (October, 1881), p. 441.

Dore, John R. *Old Bibles*, 2nd edition. Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1888.

Eadie, John. *The English Bible*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1876. Two volumes.

Eells, Hastings. *Martin Bucer*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1931.

Forstman, H. Jackson. *Word and Spirit: Calvin's Doctrine of Biblical Authority*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962.

Fry, Francis. "Standard Edition of the English New Testament of the Genevan Version," *Journal of Sacred Literature* (July, 1864), pp. 279-89.

Gardiner, John H. *The Bible as English Literature*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.

Greenslade, S. L. "English Versions of the Bible, 1525-1611," *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, S. L. Greenslade, ed. Cambridge: The University Press, 1963.

Hackett, Horatio B. "Church-Book of the Puritans at Geneva, from 1555 to 1560" *Bibliotheca Sacra* (July, 1862), p. 469f.

Heyer, Th. "Notice sur la Colonie Anglais, Ètablie à Genève de 1555 à 1560," *Memoires et Documents*, publiés par la Sociétié d'archéologie de Genève, Vol. IX, 1855, pp. 337-68.

Hoare, H. W. *The Evolution of the English Bible*, 2nd edition. London: John Murray, 1902.

Hopf, Constantin. *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946.

Hughes, Philip. *The Reformation in England*, revised edition. London: Burns and Oates, 1963. Three volumes in one.

Isaacs, J. "The Sixteenth-Century English Versions," *The Bible in its Ancient and English Versions*, H. Wheeler Robinson, ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1940.

Lupton, Lewis. *A History of the Geneva Bible*. London: The Fauconberg Press, 1966. Vol. I.

Macaulay, G. C. "The English Bible," *Quarterly Review* (October, 1911), pp. 505-530.

MacGregor, Geddes. *The Bible in the Making*. New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1959.

McLelland, Joseph C. *The Visible Words of God*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957.

McNeill, John T. *The History and Character of Calvinism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Martin, Charles. *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève au temps de Calvin 1555-1560*. Geneva: A. Jullien, Editueur, 1915.

May, Herbert Gordon. *Our English Bible in the Making*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1952.

Metzger, Bruce M. "The Geneva Bible of 1560," *Theology Today* (October, 1960), pp. 339-52.

________. "The Influence of Codex Bezae upon the Geneva Bible of 1560", *New Testament Studies* (October, 1961), p. 79f.

Meyer, Carl S. "The Geneva Bible," *Concordia Theological Monthly* (March, 1960), pp. 139-45.

Moulton, W. F. *The History of the English Bible*. London: Charles H. Kelly, 1911.

New, John F. H. "The Whitgift-Cartwright Controversy," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* (Jahrgang 59, Heft 2, 1968), pp. 203-11.

Parker, T. H. L. *English Reformers*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965.

Pocock, Nicholas. "Laurence Tomson's New Testament," *The Saturday Review* (November 6, 1880), p. 574.

________. "Some Notices on the Genevan Bible," *The Bibliographer* (July, 1883), p. 34.

________. "Some Notices on the Genevan Bible," *The Bibliographer* (September, 1884), p. 106.

________. "The Breeches Bible," *The Saturday Review* (September 25, 1880), p. 395.

________. "The Genevan Bible with Tomson's New Testament," *The Saturday Review* (November 27, 1880), p. 670.

Pope, Hugh. *English Versions of the Bible*, revised and amplified by Sebastian Bullough. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1952.

Porter, H. C. *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1958.

Ross, Don S. *The Role of John Hooper in the Religious Controversies of the Reign of Edward VI in England*. Unpublished thesis, University of Iowa, 1968.

Rupp, E. G. *Studies in the English Protestant Tradition*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1966.

________. *The Righteousness of God*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1953.

Ryrie, Charles C. "Calvinistic Emphases in the Geneva and Bishops' Bibles," *Bibliotheca Sacra* (January, 1965), pp. 23-30.

Schwarz, W. *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation; Some Reformation Controversies and their Background*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1955.

Stephen, Leslie (ed.). *Dictionary of National Biography*. London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1876. Vols. XII and LXI.

Strype, John. *Annals of the Reformation*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1824. Vol. III, Part One.

________. *Ecclesiastical Memorials*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1822. Vol. II, Part One.

________. *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*. Oxford: The University Press, 1840. Vol. I.

________. *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1821. Vol. I.

Thompson, Craig R. *The Bible in English 1525-1611*. Washington: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1958.

Trinterud, L. J. "William Tyndale's Debt to Martin Luther," *Church History* (March, 1962), pp. 24-45.

Weigle, Luther. *The English New Testament*. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1950.

Wendel, François. *Calvin, the Origins and Development of his Religious Thought*, translated by Philip Mairet. London: Wm. Collins, Sons & Co., Ltd., 1963.

Whitley, William T. *The English Bible Under the Tudor Sovereigns*. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, Ltd., (no date).

Westcott, Brooke Foss. *A General View of the History of the English Bible*, 3rd edition revised by W. A. Wright. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1916.

Wood, Anthony. *Athenae Oxonienses*. London; 1813. Vol. I.